

abolition of wealthy landowners and the gift of extensive ricefields to the people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, when the investigating committees or historians of the future are trying to ascertain why we lost the friendship of India, I want it to be perfectly clear where the responsibility should be placed.

RECESS

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 3, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 2 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Thomas Ramage Ethridge, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice Noel H. Malone, resigned.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for the terms indicated:

Mark A. May, of Connecticut, for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1956 (reappointment).

Justin Miller, of California, for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1956 (reappointment).

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1957, vice Ben Hibbs, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, by whose mercies we have been spared and by whose powers we are sustained in our earthly pilgrimage, we are coming unto Thee with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

Gird us now with courage and with confidence in Thy loving kindness for Thou art never closer unto us than when our hearts are wrung with sorrow and our heads are bowed in tribulation.

We commend unto Thy gracious care and keeping our beloved colleagues, beseeching Thee that Thou wilt share Thine eternal wisdom with the doctors and nurses for Thou art the Great Physician who canst mediate unto them divine skill and enable them to do that which is far beyond all that we can ask or think.

Grant unto the members of the sorrowing and stricken families the consolations of Thy grace and, as they bravely carry on and faithfully and patiently keep the vigil of faith, hope, and love,

may they have the blessed companionship of that friend who sticketh closer than a brother.

We thank Thee for the beautiful spirit of Thy servant, so seriously ill, who has besought us to remember in our prayer those who have harmed us. May we also emulate the example of our blessed Lord who prayed, "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do."

To Thy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6130. An act to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 235. An act for the relief of Rev. Armando Fuoco;

S. 267. An act for the relief of Pantelis Morfessis;

S. 662. An act for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou;

S. 740. An act for the relief of Santa Muciaccia (Sister Maria Fridiana), Teresa Saragaglia (Sister Maria Eutrophia), and Caterina Isonni (Sister Maria Giovita);

S. 747. An act for the relief of Jacek Von Henneberg;

S. 893. An act for the relief of David T. Wright;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Augusta Bleys (also known as Augustina Bleys);

S. 924. An act for the relief of Sofia B. Panagouloupoulos Kanell;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Cleopatra Stavros Milionis;

S. 945. An act for the relief of Moshe Gips;

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Eileen Joaquim Boa;

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo;

S. 1265. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

S. 1594. An act for the relief of Berenice Catherine Montgomery;

S. 1691. An act to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia, and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 2534. An act for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas;

S. 2698. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi;

S. 2773. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756);

S. 2937. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act;

S. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor.

AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 453, Rept. No. 1259), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7328) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT FOR SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 454, Rept. No. 1260), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6788) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

MARCH 1, 1954.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

All in Puerto Rico shocked by the savage and unbelievable lunacy perpetrated today by persons completely unrepresentative of the decent feelings of Puerto Ricans. Please convey to the House as well as to the wounded Members the deep solidarity of the whole Puerto Rican people who condemn with all their strength this dastardly deed.

LUIS MUÑOZ-MARIN,
GOVERNOR.

The SPEAKER. The Delegate from Puerto Rico (Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN) is recognized.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, on no occasion could I address this House with deeper sorrow. To add to my consternation, the name of the dear island of my birth was invoked by the reckless vandals who staged this terrible deed yesterday. To know that five of our beloved colleagues in this House have been wounded, the innocent victims of fanaticism, of fanatical terrorism, even though with the help of God their lives have been spared, has brought awe, grief, and indignation to the people of Puerto Rico.

When have the people of Puerto Rico, through their elected representatives, come before this Assembly with a request or proposal that has not been kindly received and the wishes of the people recognized and carried out? And who has given any authority, representation, or task concerning the affairs of Puerto Rico, to obscure blood-spilling individuals under the spell of diabolic inspiration, who have moved away and are no longer members of our island community, in this way to disturb the peace and mind of the great people of the United States, including the loyal citizens of the island of Puerto Rico? Why should the orderly business of Congress be interrupted by an unspeakable act, not only criminal, but stupidly and absurdly tragic? The bullets that were shot did not only sorely hurt five of our colleagues; they all hit the heart of Puerto Rico. May the Lord protect us from greater sorrows.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of the great people of Puerto Rico, I offer condolence, both collective and personal, to our fallen colleagues and their families, to the Congress and to the whole of the people of the United States. I request unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include in the RECORD the statement made yesterday by the Governor of Puerto Rico, and the resolution adopted last night by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Press reports from Washington have just been received informing that a group of persons entered the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States, then in session, and treacherously attacked its Members, wounding several distinguished Members of Congress. The assailants have been identified as members of the scant group of terrorists who call themselves the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico. The peo-

ple of Puerto Rico condemn and repudiate the actions of that group of fanatical terrorists. The bonds between the United States and Puerto Rico are predicated by the will of the people of Puerto Rico and of the Congress of the United States, on a common citizenship and on mutual respect and esteem: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico on behalf of all the people of Puerto Rico:

1. To repudiate and condemn, most emphatically, the cowardly and inconceivable attempt against the life of men who represent the will of their people.

2. To declare before the world that the act which we now repudiate and condemn, far from representing any sentiment of the people of Puerto Rico, constitutes an aggression against our own people and provokes in us such anger and indignation as is difficult to express in any language.

3. To transmit to the Congress of the United States and to the distinguished Congressmen who were wounded, the sympathy and solidarity of the legislative assembly and of all the people of Puerto Rico.

By SAMUEL R. QUIÑONES,
President, Senate of Puerto Rico.

STATEMENT OF THE GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

The whole people of Puerto Rico are deeply indignant because of this savage and unbelievable lunacy which does not express even in the most remote way the peaceful and decent nature of the Puerto Rican people.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD at this point certain cablegrams and telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

MORVIS, PUERTO RICO, March 2, 1954.

SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept our most sincere expression of regret for the most contemptible and infamous incident that occurred yesterday. This municipality of Morovis very deeply regrets and condemns this inconceivable act which in no way reflects the feelings and ideals of the people of Puerto Rico.

ANTONIO M. COLON,
Mayor.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 1, 1954.

The Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives:

It is with great emotion and indignation that I hear of the criminal attacks against the Members of the House. The feeling of shock that such a terrorist action has caused in your country will be fully shared in France. I form heartfelt wishes for the prompt recovery of your wounded colleagues.

Sincerely,

HENRI BONNET.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 1, 1954.

The SPEAKER,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of my colleagues and myself I want to express to you, Mr. Speaker, our horror and indignation at what happened this afternoon at the Capitol. We feel greatly relieved and gratified that the dastardly deed did not cause the loss of life. Kindly extend to the wounded Congressmen our deepest sympathy.

WILHELM MORGENSTIERNE,
Norwegian Ambassador, Dean of the
Diplomatic Corps.

SAN JUAN PROVINCE, March 1, 1954.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

The Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico adopted today the following concurrent resolution:

"Press reports from Washington have just been received informing that a group of persons entered the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States, then in session, and treacherously attacked its Members, wounding several distinguished Members of Congress. The assailants have been identified as members of the scant group of terrorists who call themselves the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico condemn and repudiate the actions of that group of fanatical terrorists. The bonds between the United States and Puerto Rico are predicated by the will of the people of Puerto Rico and of the Congress of the United States on a common citizenship and on mutual respect and esteem: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico on behalf of all the people of Puerto Rico:

"1. To repudiate and condemn, most emphatically, the cowardly and inconceivable attempt against the life of men who represent the will of their people.

"2. To declare before the world that the act which we now repudiate and condemn, far from representing any sentiment of the people of Puerto Rico, constitutes an aggression against our own people and provokes in us such anger and indignation as is difficult to express in any language.

"3. To transmit to the Congress of the United States and to the distinguished Congressmen who were wounded, the sympathy and solidarity of the legislative assembly and of all the people of Puerto Rico."

SAMUEL R. QUIÑONES,
President, Senate of Puerto Rico.

SAN SALVADOR, March 2, 1954.

HON. CAMARA DE REPRESENTANTES,
Washington, D. C.:

Asamblea Legislativa hondamente consternada lamenta grave incidente ocurrido hoy punto hace votos sinceros for restablecimiento completo honorables Representantes lesionados punto frantertainment.

JOSE MARIE PERALTA SALAZAR,
Presidente Asamblea Legislativa de
El Salvador Centro America.

CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR
POSTPONED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the Private Calendar in order today may be postponed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL
WORKERS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business of the House is the question on the adoption of House Resolution 450, providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 355, amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (54 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461-1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, because of the unusual situation, may I ask, is this a vote on the adoption of the resolution making in order consideration of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The vote is on the rule making the legislation in order for consideration by the House.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—yeas 197, nays 56.

So the resolution was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR THE PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS AT THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF DR. MARCUS WHITMAN

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up for immediate consideration House Concurrent Resolution 196.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed with illustrations and bound, in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Marcus Whitman, presented by the State of Washington, 5,000 copies; of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and for the use and the distribution by the Senators from Washington; and the remaining 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and for the use of and the distribution by the Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the House concurrent resolution.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was granted permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record the following statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained unanimous consent to address the House today for 30 minutes. My subject will be, "I Do Not Believe the Material You Have Suggested Would Be Useful"—An Outrageous Refusal by the Secretary of the Treasury To Furnish Information of a Nonconfidential Nature to a Member of Congress.

To those who may not be able to be on the floor this afternoon because of the press of other official business, I respectfully make the request that you take time to read my remarks, believing that they will be of interest to each individual Member.

PROSECUTE THE OUTLAWS BUT DO NOT INDICT A WHOLE PEOPLE

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, having been one of the two congressional delegates to the United Nations last fall, where I handled the issue of self-government for Puerto Rico, I believe I can add some understanding to the great tragedy which struck the House yesterday.

These assassins who shot down five of our colleagues are members of the so-called Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico. This group, which has never qualified as a legitimate political party, is a notorious terrorist organization. It is the same organization which instigated the bloody 1950 riots in Puerto Rico, the assault on Government House and the attempted murder of the Governor of Puerto Rico, and which incited the murder of the chief of the Puerto Rican police in 1936. Its members attempted assassination of President Truman and killed one of his guards in the same ruthless demonstration of insanity that was repeated here yesterday.

But in fairness to the 2½ million people of Puerto Rico, we should recognize that this terrorist band represents less than 500 members. The so-called Nationalist Party no more represents the true feelings of the people of Puerto Rico than the Communist Party represents the sentiments of the people of the United States.

Moreover, let us not confuse this band with the Independence Party, which is a small, legitimate party that seeks to achieve its political aims by democratic and constitutional methods.

Through the free expression of an overwhelming majority of its people in democratic elections, Puerto Rico has

achieved a full measure of self-government under its new constitution. In Puerto Rico's association with the United States, we continue to control matters of defense and foreign relations.

When I presented the decision of the United States Government on Puerto Rican self-government before the United Nations, the General Assembly endorsed that decision. It was extremely important to our relations with the rest of the world that we should get that U. N. endorsement.

In presenting that case before the bar of world opinion, the United States delegation was aided immensely by Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico; the Honorable Ernesto Ramos-Antonini, speaker of the Puerto Rican House of Representatives; Dr. Arturo Morales-Carrión, under secretary of state; Dr. Jose Trias-Monge, secretary of justice; and other distinguished Puerto Rican-Americans. These fine men are representative of all but the lunatic fringe in a nation whose people—citizens of the United States since 1917—appreciate the mutual benefits obtained by their present Commonwealth status.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Governments of both the United States and Puerto Rico prosecute every member of this band for what they are, a band of terrorists. But I also urge that we recognize that the Puerto Rican people—with slight exceptions—are strong friends of the United States and are as shocked and dismayed at yesterday's action as we are.

REPORT ON PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Public Accounts Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee is in the process of reporting our findings on the investigation which our subcommittee undertook concerning the government of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. In view of yesterday's unfortunate occurrence, I should like to take this opportunity to advise the Congress of an excerpt from our report on Puerto Rico. I am making the statement at this time in fairness to Governor Muñoz-Marín and the other loyal American citizens of Puerto Rico.

The excerpt is as follows:

One matter discussed with the Governor was the situation regarding the Nationalist Party and the role it played in the government of Puerto Rico. The Governor stated that this extreme group of radicals represented only a very small proportion of the Puerto Rican citizens, estimated to be less than 500 in number among the more than 2 million decent liberty-loving American citizens of Puerto Rico. They agitate for complete freedom for Puerto Rico, which is exactly contrary to the wishes of the vast majority of the Puerto Rican citizens. They have not been able to elect a single member to the Puerto Rican Legislature.

There is no doubt, in my mind, that there is a direct tieup between the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico and the Communist International. The Governor is doing everything possible within the framework of constitutional procedure to suppress this group, whose actions are considered disgraceful and of great harm to the cause of Puerto Rico.

Our subcommittee was very favorably impressed by Governor Muñoz-Marín and his administration as will be indicated by our subcommittee report, which will be submitted in the very near future.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 8127, the highway-aid bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

BATTLESHIP "OLYMPIA"

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the proposal of the Department of the Navy that the famous old warship *Olympia* be scrapped, I have today introduced a bill to transfer the ownership of the *Olympia* to the State of Washington.

It is appropriate that this ship, with its glorious history, and named, as it is, after the capital of Washington State, be preserved as an historic shrine to remind future generations of the part our Navy has played in the history of our great Nation.

The *Olympia* was the flagship of Admiral Dewey at the Battle of Manila Bay. She was the ship that brought the body of the Unknown Soldier back to the United States after the First World War. She is now resting at her berth in the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

Mr. Speaker, I am most appreciative of the predicament of the Navy. It is obviously wasteful to maintain the *Olympia*. Before any program to scrap her is inaugurated, however, the people of her namesake city and State should be given the opportunity to claim her.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to transfer the special order granted him for yesterday to today.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

IMPORT FEES ON WOOL

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, less than one-third of the wool consumed in the United States is produced by American growers.

The balance of our supply is furnished by foreign sources which can sell below the American standard of living and cost of production. Yet even so, we have wool shorn in 1951 and 1952 stacked in warehouses under our present loan-support program. The taxpayers are paying for fighting the moths and for the storage of this wool and we are loaning money on the 1953 clip of wool, with every indication that we will have to foreclose on that and pay further storage on support activities.

The Department of Agriculture has told the Tariff Commission there is a need for additional import fees to be levied under section 22 of the Agricultural Act. A Tariff Commission recommendation on the matter has gone to the President. The President now has the authority to impose these import fees, which would permit the American grown wool to be sold on the American market and for the Government to sell its inventory without loss.

Surely the President will act promptly and set an import fee sufficient to permit our support program, voted by this Congress, to work for our needed wool industry.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461-1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the House Joint Resolution 355, with Mr. KEATING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, our unfortunate colleague, Mr. ALVIN M. BENTLEY, one of the victims of yesterday's tragic event, was very much interested in this legislation. He was prepared to express that interest by addressing the House during the debate. I am going to read the remarks which he would have presented had he had the opportunity to do so. I want also to say that I am thoroughly in accord with what he has to say, and I want to emphasize that this is important to me in my district as well, as our districts border one another, and are much the same

in the great State of Michigan. However, before I do that I would like to make a statement regarding the condition of my colleague, and very dear and close personal friend. I have been at the hospital a number of times. The latest report I had is that he is coming along as well as could possibly be expected. I talked to his sister some few minutes ago. The family has been out there, and they feel they are very fortunate that his life has been spared, and we pray that God will look after him and his dear wife.

This is the statement which was prepared by Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, in recent weeks I have received a great number of letters from my home district urging congressional action to insure a supply of Mexican workers to harvest the so-called stoop crops for 1954. Because of the recent expiration of our agreement with Mexico our growers face great losses of vegetable and fruit crops if they are not assured adequate hand labor. In order to emphasize the seriousness of the problem I would like to quote from some of the letters I have received.

Mr. James Graham, of route 3, Freeland, in calling attention to the need for Mexican labor, states: "This will mean a lot to our community as we grow a lot of pickles, tomatoes, snap beans, sugar beets, etc., or all work that takes stooped labor. Domestic labor is very scarce and they do not prefer this kind of work so the national labor is very essential to our locality, without this Mexican national agriculture labor it would be very difficult for us to operate."

Mr. R. C. Mayan, of Merrill, Mich., states: "I know from my observation locally that were it not for the Mexican nationals labor brought into this area that our crops of sugar beets, pickles and cucumbers would definitely have suffered for the lack of this type of labor and I also know from experience that the importing of white labor from the South has not proven satisfactory."

Mr. James W. Burgess, of St. Charles, Mich., states: "We would appreciate your full support for Public Law No. 78 to make it possible in continuing migrating Mexican national workers that are required for hand labor and hoeing that we need for such crops as sugar beets, picking cucumbers, hoeing beans, and harvesting potatoes. These are the major crops in our community."

Mr. M. C. Henderson, executive secretary-treasurer of Michigan Field Crops, Inc., a nonprofit cooperative organization serving some 30,000 Michigan farmers in matters of procuring field labor, writes that "Since before the beginning of World War II, local domestic supplies have been insufficient to harvest the many crops requiring hand labor, such as cherries, peaches, snap beans, pickles, sugar beets, onions and like products."

Mr. C. L. Brody, executive vice president of the Michigan Farm Bureau, writes:

"I am advised that available appropriations for administration of the Mexican farm labor program will be exhausted February 12, 1954. Since the expiration of the agreement with Mexico on January 15, 1954, the United States Government has instituted a unilateral program in providing for the admission and contracting of Mexican labor."

"I understand that negotiations with Mexico for a new bilateral agreement are being carried on. In the meantime, however, funds are needed to carry on the unilateral program. I understand that under the unilateral agreement several improvements in the contract with Mexican nationals have been put into effect by the Department of Labor. This is an important matter to Michigan as large numbers of Mexican workers are needed."

"Therefore, the Michigan Farm Bureau is requesting your support, first, of a supplemental appropriation to carry on after February 12, 1954, and second, your support of Senate Joint Resolution 121 and House Joint Resolution 355 to authorize the unilateral Mexican farm labor program. We are not informed as to the amount of money needed for the supplementary appropriation, but understand that the Budget Department has approved \$550,000.

"We shall greatly appreciate your interest and support."

Letter after letter has emphasized again and again the need for Mexican labor to handle crops in Michigan. The growers must have early action on this matter in order to plan.

I have contacted the Labor Department with regard to the need for labor in this area and their findings confirm the need. Mr. Robert Goodwin, Director of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security, in answer to my recent inquiry, stated: "Our farm placement service does have a classification of agricultural reporting areas which are concerned only with agricultural labor data. You are correct in your assumption that there has been a shortage of seasonal farm labor in your congressional district. During 1953 we certified to a shortage of such labor in the Bay City area which includes Saginaw County and 9 other adjacent counties, and permitted the temporary importation of 760 Mexican workers under the provisions of Public Law 78 and 210 British West Indians under the provisions of Public Law 414."

The Michigan Employment Security Commission in its postseason farm-labor report for 1953 makes several statements in this regard:

"Recruitment started in the early spring. Since Michigan is a highly industrialized State and factories are humming, no appreciable number of local workers were available. It was necessary to recruit workers from other States.

"Generally local labor was not interested in working on activities necessary for production and harvest of sugar beets, pickles, and muck crops. However, vegetable, berry, and fruit harvest appealed to them.

"For some activities which did not appeal to domestic workers or in times of acute labor shortages, the importation of foreign labor was a vital factor in averting crop losses."

This report also states that the 1954 season presents the same problems with regard to securing an adequate labor supply as did 1953. Many people feel that mechanized equipment is replacing such labor but the following statement from the aforementioned report indicates how gradual this change is.

"No new mechanized equipment was introduced in 1953 to materially reduce the requirements of seasonal farm labor. Some improvements were made in the design of the sugar beet thinner and weeder as well as the harvester. Farmers have not accepted the thinner and weeder in the same manner as the harvester. About 50 percent of the beets were blocked, thinned, and weeded by hand, whereas only 10 percent were harvested by hand labor."

In closing I would like to emphasize that the type of labor the Mexican nationals provide is very indispensable to the vegetable and fruitgrowers of Michigan. I strongly urge the passage of House Joint Resolution 355 which will authorize recruitment of such labor at the border.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill. I think it has been represented to be a great many things which it is not. In the first place, it is not a bill involving foreign policy in any sense. It is

not a wetback bill, as it has been called, except in the sense that the passage of this legislation will assist the Department of Justice and the Immigration Service in controlling the illegal influx of the wetbacks.

I do not think anyone would seriously contend that this Nation or any nation does not have the right and authority to prescribe the conditions under which those who enter it from the outside may obtain and carry out employment in this country. It is true that in the past we have operated the Mexican-labor program under an agreement with Mexico, setting up the terms of employment, and other conditions under which these Mexican laborers should work in this country.

We did that not because there was any necessity for doing it but simply as a matter of comity and as a way of bringing about a better understanding between the two countries with respect to the use of this labor.

This resolution does not in any sense affect the wetback or illegal entrant into this country. The Attorney General has requested the passage of this legislation for the reason that he believes it will help control the illegal immigration. Those who come into this country and who are placed on farms in this country under the program will all come in legally; they will come in through the regular ports of entry.

If there is a way by which these Mexicans can come in legally, I believe it is reasonable to assume, that there will be a smaller number who will try to come in illegally; and we do know that they will come in one way or another because of the great difference in the wage scales in the two countries.

We have had no cooperation from the Mexican Government in keeping out the Mexican labor because as I understand it, under the constitution of Mexico that country has no authority to prevent any Mexican citizen from leaving or entering that country—at least that is the reason they have given for their failure to prevent illegal entrants from leaving Mexico. So we have had no cooperation from that nation in our efforts to keep out the wetbacks. With a borderline of more than 2,000 miles between this country and Mexico it is impossible to keep all illegal entrants out. We believe this legislation makes it possible to set up a program whereby those who enter legally will be able to find employment at good wages. It is felt by the Attorney General, by the Department of Labor and by the Department of Agriculture that the bill will very materially assist in relieving the wetback problem and at the same time furnish American farmers with a needed labor supply.

I want to take just a moment or two to give you something of the history of this program. During the war we had a labor program which expired in 1947, and since that time we have been operating under the present program. Every year we have had much difficulty in negotiating an agreement with the Mexican Government. I am not going to detail the situation as it occurred year by year, but generally speaking the Mexican Government refused to make

an agreement, or kept postponing any final decision or any action on the matter, until the peak season for the use of the labor had arrived in this country. Then under the pressure of that situation our negotiators were forced to capitulate to the Mexican demands or go without any labor whatever.

Mr. Chairman, coming down to this year, negotiations with Mexico under the present law began last October and continued up to January without any agreement being reached. Contrary to what has been said, these negotiations have never been broken off by the American Government. However they were suspended as far as any action taken was concerned for a brief period, in fact until after the hearings were begun on this legislation, at which time they were resumed, and I am happy to say that some progress has been made. I attribute that progress to the fact we have been considering this legislation.

I do not desire, of course, to criticize the great nation of Mexico or its government, but I believe that most of our trouble in connection with these negotiations has come about because of the fact that the Government of Mexico has felt we could not carry out this program without an agreement with that country. As long as they felt that that was the situation they held out for all they could get, in the way of concessions, and some very unreasonable concessions it seems to me.

More than that, in the past, the Mexican Government has chosen to apply a unilateral interpretation of the provisions of these agreements. American farmers who thought that they had a contract for Mexican laborers based upon an agreement soon found out that they did not have the contract they thought they had at all. For one thing, the Mexican Government frequently raised a question about subsistence rates which the agreement covered rather specifically. But after a contract had been made, American farmers were confronted with demands from Mexican consuls in this country that the subsistence rate be raised.

In addition to that, farmers who have undertaken to use this labor have found that the Mexican consuls were demanding that the wage be increased above the prevailing wage in the community.

Furthermore, the Mexican Government has arbitrarily assumed the authority to blacklist entire counties in the United States and to forbid their nationals from working in those counties without any reason whatsoever as far as anyone in this country was able to find out.

They have insisted upon certain insurance provisions being put into effect which were not in any way made mandatory by provisions of the agreement between the two countries.

I could go on and name other instances, which I will not take the time to do now, where the Mexican Government has insisted upon a unilateral interpretation of the contract. And because we needed this labor we have been forced to agree to those interpretations.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman, briefly.

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact, for the past year or probably 2 or 3 years, we have been operating virtually under a unilateral agreement with Mexico as a result of the interpretations, arbitrary and summary, that have been made on the part of Mexico with respect to these various points to which the gentleman has just referred; is that not correct?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, I think that is a very accurate and a fair statement of the matter.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOLDEN. Is it not true that the negotiators on the part of Mexico insisted on many benefits to these Mexican nationals that were not given to our own people here in America; and that they continued to insist upon those without making any efforts to agree for many, many months, while our negotiators were trying to make a decent agreement with that country?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for another question?

Mr. HOPE. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. It is also true that as to practically every one of these points to which the gentleman has referred, pertaining to subsistence, minimum wages, blacklisting, insurance, the interpretations the Mexican Government has given to those points and the position of the Mexican Government on those points have been directly contrary to the wording of the international agreement that has been in effect; is not that correct?

Mr. HOPE. I am sure that the hearings, which were quite extensive on this measure, will bear out the statement that the gentleman has made.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Would the gentleman explain whether there is any provision in the bill to assure us that the Mexicans who come over here to do this work—and I am in sympathy with this bill—can be gotten out of this country and back to Mexico, to be sure that they do not stay here and interfere with our immigration laws? The language in the bill does not spell that out very clearly to me. From the gentleman's study of the bill, I thought he might be able to throw some light on that subject.

Mr. HOPE. This bill simply amends the act which we passed last year by saying that it shall be in effect not only when there is an agreement with Mexico, but also after efforts have been made in good faith to reach an agreement, and there has been a failure to reach an agreement. So the provisions of the bill which we passed last year govern, as far as the return of these Mexicans to Mexico is concerned, after they have completed their contracts in this country.

The provisions of the bill to which this joint resolution is an amendment provide that these people must return to Mexico as soon as they have completed their contracts in this country; that they are here illegally after that time.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield to me for one further question?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman to give us an illustration, or give us the benefit of his knowledge, of what has transpired heretofore under the existing law? Have we had any serious trouble after bringing Mexican nationals in, as we have been doing for years, in getting a count on those who were here and then getting them to return to Mexico? Has there been any trouble with those who did not return? Was there interference with the immigration authorities so that an additional burden was thrown upon them? What is the fact in respect to that?

Mr. HOPE. No; there has been no serious trouble with the Mexicans who came in legally under this program. The gentleman knows, as we all know, that many Mexicans come in illegally. Those who come in illegally and who are not in any way affected by this bill have caused most of the trouble.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the people did not hire the wetbacks they would not come in, would they? Somebody in this country is hiring them, otherwise there would not be an inducement for them to come in here.

Mr. HOPE. That is undoubtedly true. What this bill does is permit entrants to come in legally, so that we will not have to depend on the wetbacks to harvest our crops and keep our food supply from spoiling. If we do not pass this legislation we know Mexicans will come in. They have come in every year illegally. We know they will continue to as long as there is the differential between wages in this country and Mexico that exists at the present time. Those people are coming in. There is no way to keep them out on a border 2,000 miles long. We could not keep them out absolutely unless we had the United States Army strung along that border. But we believe and the Attorney General believes we will have less trouble and fewer illegal entrants if we permit them to come in legally. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman of course recognizes that the Government of Mexico has a right to undertake to protect its own nationals?

Mr. HOPE. I do not recognize they have a right to protect their own nationals which is superior to the right of this country to define the conditions under which citizens of another country may seek and obtain and carry out employment in this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish the gentleman would think that answer of his over, because I hardly think it represents the views of my friend, having served with him so many years, because

we certainly are acting unilaterally in this bill. The gentleman's answer would indicate that he does not recognize the right of the Government of Mexico, although we may not agree with it, to undertake to protect its own nationals. The gentleman's answer would indicate that he denies that.

Mr. HOPE. They have a right to undertake anything they want to, but we do not have to yield to their ideas as to what conditions their nationals should work under in this country. They are here by reason of our sufferance, as far as that is concerned. We admit them here for a certain purpose. They are here by our permission while they are here. I am sure my friend does not want to say that we do not have the right as a sovereign nation to say how they shall conduct themselves while they are in this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says they are here by sufferance. We are trying to induce them to come here, are we not? A wetback would be here in violation of the law.

Mr. HOPE. They do not obtain any rights when they come in here that we do not choose to give them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think the passage of this joint resolution would be conducive to good relationships between the United States and the Government of Mexico?

Mr. HOPE. Let me answer in this way: These negotiations have been going on since last October. I will not say they broke down in January because they never were actually broken off, but we submitted a proposal to the Mexican Government at that time. We had no reply from it. However, since the introduction of this legislation and the hearings that were held by the Committee on Agriculture, these negotiations have been resumed, and I am happy to say some progress has been made. I do not believe that indicates that there has been any disruption of our relations or any worsening of our relations during that time. As I said a while ago, as long as the Mexican Government believes that we have to operate under an agreement it is going to be pretty tough to get along with. But we do not have to operate under an agreement. We can operate unilaterally. When they are convinced of that fact, as I think they are now, I believe it will be possible for us to reach an agreement within a very short time. Of course, we want to reach an agreement. That is the purpose.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understood it was said we had to operate under a bilateral agreement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 20]

Ayres	Carrigg	Davis, Tenn.
Baker	Celler	Dawson, Ill.
Battle	Chatham	Dingell
Bentley	Chelf	Durham
Buckley	Clardy	Ellsworth
Campbell	Coudert	Fallon

Gamble	Oakman	Sheppard
Jensen	Reed, Ill.	Taylor
Kersten, Wis.	Richards	Thomas
Krueger	Rivers	Vursell
Lantaff	Roberts	Wainwright
Morrison	Roosevelt	Weichel
Moulder, Mo.	Shafer	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. KEATING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 355, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 387 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal. The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have stood in the well of the House for several years now to call the attention of the Members of this body and their staffs and families to an interesting and very helpful opportunity afforded all of us. During the historic lenten season which begins on Wednesday, March 3, the various Protestant denominations cooperate in noonday services daily on Capitol Hill.

The services are held daily, Monday through Friday, from 12:10 to 12:30 in the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, 212 East Capitol Street, and the speakers are from the various Protestant denominations. Everybody will receive a most cordial welcome.

The church is located opposite the Folger Shakespeare Library and across the street from the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court. It is, therefore, in quick walking distance from the Capitol and the Senate and House Office Buildings.

In these difficult days in which we live and study national and world problems I, for one, believe most sincerely that we should learn and understand afresh the spiritual foundations of our democratic way of life. We can strengthen our country in the long run only upon these spiritual foundations of our democratic way of life.

The lenten season comes at a fitting time to reinforce and guide us all.

I would commend these services to my fellow Members for their personal attendance. I would also suggest that we make it possible for our staffs to attend.

The list of speakers for the entire 6 weeks period is as follows:

Ash Wednesday, March 3: Dr. Lawrence D. Folkemer, Church of the Reformation.

Thursday, March 4: Rev. Robert E. Lee, St. Luke's Lutheran Church.

Friday, March 5: Rev. Robert J. Plumb, St. Mark's Episcopal Church.

Monday, March 8: Dr. Hirl A. Kester, Waugh Methodist Church.

Tuesday, March 9: Mrs. Clarence T. Nelson, Augustana Lutheran Church.

Wednesday, March 10: Mrs. Nelson.

Thursday, March 11: Mrs. Nelson.

Friday, March 12: Mrs. Nelson.

Monday, March 15: Rev. James C. Fahl, Metropolitan Presbyterian Church.

Tuesday, March 16: Dr. Edward G. Latch, Metropolitan Methodist Church.

Wednesday, March 17: Dr. Latch.

Thursday, March 18: Dr. Albert P. Shirkey, Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church.

Friday, March 19: Dr. Shirkey.

Monday, March 22: Rev. Paul Diehl, Trinity Methodist Church.

Tuesday, March 23: Dr. Carl Heath Koupf, First Congregational Church.

Wednesday, March 24: Dr. Kopf.

Thursday, March 25: Dr. Kopf.

Friday, March 26: Dr. Kopf.

Monday, March 29: Rev. Paul E. Horn, Memorial Evangelical United Brethren Church.

Tuesday, March 30: Dr. Clarence W. Cranford, Calvary Baptist Church.

Wednesday, March 31: Dr. Cranford.

Thursday, April 1: Dr. Cranford.

Friday, April 2: Dr. Cranford.

Monday, April 5: Rev. Duane Ramsey, Church of the Brethren.

Tuesday, April 6: Rev. Paul R. Schearrer, Takoma Park Presbyterian Church.

Wednesday, April 7: Reverend Schearrer.

Thursday, April 8: Dr. Edward H. Pruden, First Baptist Church.

Friday, April 9: Dr. Pruden.

HOLY WEEK

Monday, April 12: Rev. Otto Reimherr, Hope Lutheran Church.

Tuesday, April 13: Dr. Carl R. Simon, Keller Memorial Lutheran Church.

Wednesday, April 14: Dr. Folkemer.

Thursday, April 15: Dr. Robert E. Van Deusen, National Lutheran Council.

Good Friday, April 16: The 3-hour service, 12 to 3 p. m.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great regret that I find myself in opposition to the members of my committee, the Committee on Agriculture, which presented this joint resolution for your consideration.

For almost 20 years now I have served on that very important committee. During that entire time I have served with my beloved colleague from Kansas, the distinguished gentleman who is now chairman of that committee, Mr. CLIFFORD HOPE. No fairer man ever lived. No greater American ever lived. During the 20 years we have served together seldom, if ever, have we had even the slightest kind of controversy.

I want you to know just what has happened with reference to this resolution. I assure you that in my consideration of it I have divorced myself from every partisan consideration. I have approached it with an impartial mind in an effort to judge it for what it was worth. In opposing this resolution I have nothing at stake except my inmost feelings and my own integrity. I accord to every other member of my committee the best of motives, although I question the wisdom of their judgment.

I bring this opposition to you to the end that you may evaluate it and may lift yourselves above the bondages of prejudices and partisan politics. I present it to you in the hope that we may reason together in the best interests of our own great country.

Just one minute about the history of the legislation. We were called into executive session on February 3 by our distinguished chairman to consider our legislative program for the current session. On that morning almost all the members of our committee were there. When we entered the room for executive session, lo and behold we found there a man by the name of Rocco Siciliano, Assistant Secretary of Labor. Our chairman asked us if we would hear the Assistant Secretary of Labor discuss a resolution which he then presented and discussed. The doors of our committee room were closed. Not another human being except the members of the committee heard Mr. Siciliano's testimony. When he had concluded his presentation, I interrogated him and one of the questions I propounded was in substance this: Is this resolution not likely to impair the friendship between the great Governments of America and the Republic of Mexico? To which he replied: "It might have very grave effect."

Now, that is in the record. I want to say here that when Mr. Siciliano concluded his statement, I pointed out to our distinguished chairman that we were in star chamber session, that no public hearings had been held, and that this was a highly controversial bill, and that I thought that by all means we should open the doors of our committee room and have public hearings. The always reasonable chairman of our great committee immediately arranged for public hearings. So the committee room doors were opened. The public was invited to come and present their views, pro and con. They came from near and far, and we had extensive hearings. I do not believe that any member of the committee now regrets that we threw open the doors of the committee room and held public hearings.

I am frank to say, unfortunately, that the public hearings did not change many opinions of the members of that committee. Why did this man appear there on February 3? I will tell you why. He came there unannounced. No member of our committee knew he was coming except, perhaps, the chairman, and he came there because on the day before, February 2, the great Comptroller General of the United States had issued an order, the effect of which was to say to the Labor Department, "You are operating an illegal program and you must stop." So within 24 hours, this man from the Department of Labor, Mr. Siciliano, appeared before our committee and wanted us to legalize that which Lindsay Warren had said was illegal. So we had the hearings. I asked who represented agriculture on the negotiating team, and Mr. Siciliano looked at his colleagues from the Department—and I said, "Do you mean you do not know the man's name?" and they did not even know the man's name nor his title. So then I said this is an amendment to an agricultural law; where is the report from the Department of Agriculture; and they looked around and they did not even have a report. But from that day on they got a report from Agriculture, Justice, Labor, and from the Department of State. But every single one of those

communications was signed by a man in the lower echelon—not a Cabinet officer would dignify this measure by signing his name to any document approving its passage. The four departments, and I called them the “four horsemen,” rode herd on our committee for 2 weeks. The chairman had said that at the end of the hearings we would go into executive session for the vote.

Go back one minute. In that star-chamber session—and it was a star-chamber session—there was an effort made to report this bill. When I pointed out the unheard-of procedure about to be followed, the man who made the motion withdrew it.

Now we have this measure here. They went straight from our committee room to the Rules Committee. The transcript of the evidence had not even been made available to the Members of this House. They demanded a rule, and even at that moment the hearings were not available.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHELLEY. Will the gentleman advise us the number of members of the committee present at the time the bill was acted upon by the committee?

Mr. COOLEY. I think I can do that with propriety, because it was disclosed to the Rules Committee. Although the distinguished chairman had announced that the vote would come immediately upon the conclusion of the hearings, although every member of the committee knew that, when the chips were down and the votes were taken, out of 16 Republicans on that committee only 6 were there. Six out of 16. I am sure all of them had a perfectly legitimate and proper excuse to be absent. But the fact is they were not there. So this bill comes out here as if it were a unanimous report from our Committee on Agriculture, when 10 Republicans did not even record their votes or express their wishes in the final vote.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has attempted to reflect upon the attendance record of the Republican members.

Mr. COOLEY. No, no.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does recall that it was February 12, Lincoln's birthday?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly I am not criticizing any of the members of our great committee. I realize that the vote was taken, as my chairman has said, on Lincoln's birthday, February 12. I am perfectly willing to believe that each absent member had a perfectly legitimate excuse for being absent on that day, but the fact remains that only 6 Republicans attended the meeting. I am trying to emphasize the fact that there was no urgency which could have possibly required that the voting should have taken place on Lincoln's birthday. Certainly I did not call for the vote, nor did I arrange for the meeting. I was perfectly willing at all times for the meeting to have been postponed. Actually, had the decision been left to me, I would have

postponed it indefinitely pending the negotiations which had been resumed at the request of the President of our own great country. But the vote was taken. My colleagues know that I patiently waited for a quorum to arrive. When the meeting was called to order a quorum was not present, but finally 17 out of the 30 members came into the committee room and the votes were taken. Fourteen voted “aye,” 2 voted “no,” and there was 1 abstention. Six Republicans and 8 Democrats, making a total of 14, less than a majority of our 30-man committee, reported this very urgent administration must legislation. I still wonder why the must. The only explanation is that our Government officials thought that they must have a blackjack. You just do not compose differences with blackjacks and bowie knives or shotguns and pistols.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman contend there are more than two members of the committee at this time who are opposed to this legislation?

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no. I am not making that contention at all. I am perfectly willing to stand here alone in my opposition to this resolution. There is one thing that I have tried to teach myself all the days of my life and that is never to permit myself to be disappointed. I was not disappointed by the vote in our committee. I shall not be disappointed by the vote which will soon be taken on the pending measure. But most of all, I shall not disappoint myself by offending my own sensibilities regarding this very important resolution.

My recollection is that the star-chamber courts were abolished in England in about 1640. I believe you will agree with me that it would have been very unfortunate if this resolution had been reported by our committee at the time that the first motion to report the resolution was made. I cannot believe that our great chairman would have permitted this resolution to have been reported under such circumstances. When he realized the import of its purpose he very readily agreed for hearings to be held. I have no right to criticize the actions of Senators, but I understand that a similar resolution was reported in a star chamber session without the benefit of the testimony of a single solitary witness at the other end of the Capitol. Our committee has never operated in secrecy, and I hope that it never shall. Regardless of the outcome, when the final vote is taken here today, I know that all of us will be happy in the glad thought that our committee room doors were thrown open and committee hearings were held.

Let us dispel all this misunderstanding about this important measure. I am very much afraid that you have been led to believe that this resolution merely extends the existing law and the programs we have had through the years. That is far from being the truth. Just a moment ago I commended the chairman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, LEO ALLEN, upon the splendid manner in which he presented the rule, but I am frank to say that just about all of the debate on the rule was well calculated

to lead Members to believe that this is just merely an extension of the Mexican farm labor law. Now what is the truth? In 1948 Congress enacted a law, the purpose of which was to provide a program for the recruitment of Mexican farm labor. The law contemplated an agreement between the two countries, an agreement with the dignity of a treaty, but an agreement between employer and employee which would provide a degree of security for both. Under that law agreements were negotiated, contracts were made, and Mexican labor worked in the fields of America. In 1951 when I was chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture that law was rewritten and reenacted and pursuant to the amended law other agreements were negotiated and other contracts were written. Under the present administration, just last year, that law was renewed and extended through the year 1955. This was done at the request of the present administration and the law is still in full force and effect. Even the laws I have referred to met with formidable opposition when each of the bills was presented. It was never contemplated that Mexican laborers would be brought into this country to take the jobs of Americans. Mexican labor was to be brought into America only when American labor was not available, and only when the Department of Labor had certified that American workers were not ready, willing, and able to take and to perform the jobs in which labor was then needed.

When our committee was considering an extension of the Mexican farm-labor law in 1953, during the hearings, our chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], indicated that he thought that the agreements were working satisfactorily, and actually the people in the Department of Labor indicated that they, too, thought that the agreements were working well.

Now, all of a sudden, we find ourselves in the very unfortunate position of not being able to compose differences which have arisen. We were told that there were 7 or 8 points in dispute, but that not one of them had been composed. From the very beginning I insisted upon an honest effort in further negotiations to compose all the differences involved. For some reason unknown to me and I think actually unknown to you—the Republican lash is being used and we are told that this is a “must” bill, but we are not told why it is a “must” bill. Let me remind you that the law is on the books; our negotiators are negotiating; great progress has been made and a contract or agreement may soon be announced.

Now, perhaps you will think it is very audacious of me, a Democratic Congressman to communicate with the White House and with the others with whom I have communicated.

My first objection was that this resolution would disrupt our friendly relations with our great neighbor south of the border. Our people had terminated the negotiations and had come home north of the border to operate operations unilaterally. This was a great affront and an insult of the people of Mexico. So I called the White House and I asked: “What did the President say

to the Ambassador from Mexico about this resolution?" I was told that the President expressed the hope that negotiations would be resumed immediately and actually that very night in Mexico City negotiations were resumed at Mr. Eisenhower's request, and they have continued from that time up until now, and the last report came to me yesterday from the Department of Labor.

I checked also with the Mexican Ambassador.

Now, if your President and mine has caused these negotiations to be resumed why should we wave this red flag in the face of the Mexican people? Why should we insult them by saying that they cannot negotiate with their neighbors in good faith and cannot intelligently compose differences?

The negotiations have led to this point, that Mr. White, our Ambassador, has said that within a week or two they will conclude an agreement. We were told by the gentleman who flew in from California that if this bill was not reported before midnight tomorrow night and signed by the President that the wetbacks who had come into this country legally would thereafter remain here illegally. He must have known that that could have been rectified, and it was indeed. Our Government officials have authorized renewal of those employment contracts for 6 weeks.

All I have been pleading for in connection with this bill is to delay its consideration until those negotiations could be consummated and put into a written document, an agreement. But no, they have run the steamroller; and why, heaven only knows, especially when we realize that yesterday in Caracas a very serious and important conference of the American family of nations was convened. Unfortunately the hostile atmosphere was so intense that our great Secretary of State was met at the airport and taken to his hotel in a bullet-proof automobile with the heaviest guard that ever surrounded a diplomat of our country. Here he is in that hostile atmosphere. Here we are about to insult and offend Mexico. This resolution will definitely offend the Republic of Mexico.

I called the Ambassador, a little unusual for a Congressman, I suppose, to be calling a diplomat, but I did it because of my intense interest in the international aspects of this resolution. He said definitely that it will have a bad effect on our relationship, that if we pass this resolution it will hit the headlines of all the newspapers of Mexico and great antagonism will be aroused.

Why should we disturb Mr. Eisenhower's negotiations, I ask you? It is not urgent. The record shows that Mr. Siciliano stated that this resolution was brought here because this is the season of the year when the labor was needed less than at any other season of the year. That is the record. Yet we have it here.

I did not stop with the White House, I did not stop with the Mexican Ambassador; I said before the Rules Committee that it was my belief that Secretary John Foster Dulles had never known anything about this resolution. I took it upon myself to call the Secretary of State and he frankly admitted that he

did not know anything about it, but he assured me he would investigate immediately. The very next morning his assistant was in my office. I discussed the matter at length with him. I told him about my opposition, about my apprehension regarding the international aspects, and he said he would go back and reappraise it. The Mexican Ambassador went down to the State Department to see Mr. Morton and to discuss it. I did not stop there. I told the Rules Committee that this resolution would destroy all the good that had been accomplished by Milton Eisenhower's trip to South America. He went there on a friendly mission, and this thing is an unfriendly act.

I called Milton Eisenhower in Pennsylvania. He was surprised and amazed, and told me he would call Secretary Dulles the next day. Secretary Dulles is a busy man—I am not blaming him. But this is an important resolution. It is not needed. We now have the law, the negotiations are being carried on, and if we can defeat this bill I venture the assertion that within 10 days a contract will be signed.

In a telephone conversation only yesterday morning I mentioned to Mr. Siciliano the desirability of postponing action in the House because negotiations were coming along so well and that it might prove embarrassing diplomatically and to our negotiator. Mr. Siciliano said, "I do not disagree with you at all." In fact, Mr. Siciliano said that Secretary Mitchell had said at the White House there might be reason for wanting to postpone it. Then Mr. Mitchell said that he would have to tell them at the White House this might be embarrassing to Mr. Dulles. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] did not tell the membership of this House what took place at the White House, but here it is.

Mr. Chairman, here it is. Why on earth should we do something to embarrass Mr. Dulles and to embarrass Ambassador White in our negotiations with a friendly country?

I could stand up here and talk for the rest of the day about this resolution and about the law. The Lord in Heaven knows I have no ax to grind, and I have no purpose that should not be your purpose; that is, to see to it that our Government deals in a friendly way with a friendly nation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Did the gentleman read the remarks of the majority leader on yesterday or hear them, in which he said that he had just come from a conference at the White House and at that conference with the President of the United States he was told that this legislation is vitally necessary?

Mr. COOLEY. I heard it. I heard the speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], but I am saying that the gentleman did not tell the House that Secretary of Labor Mitchell said it might be embarrassing to Mr. Dulles.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman very well knows that the State Department has approved this legislation?

Mr. COOLEY. The State Department sent up a letter signed by an assistant, Mr. Morton, yes, but not by Mr. Dulles.

Mr. HOEVEN. Does the gentleman contend that he does not speak for the State Department?

Mr. COOLEY. I contend that he has no right to take the position he has in what he has asked of this Congress. This is not a continuation of law. He is asking this Congress to invalidate the law that has been on the books since 1948, and to come in through the back door.

Do you know what kind of diplomacy this is? It is the "slam-the-door, go-it-alone diplomatic policy"; and I mean slam the door, because they have actually slammed the door on every employment station in the interior of Mexico.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have the situation of our Secretary of State in Venezuela now, appealing for amity among the nations of North and South America. Only Sunday the President sent a letter to Dr. Charles W. Mayo, president of the American Association for the United Nations, on the occasion of the association's 3-day conference on United States responsibility for world leadership; and among other things the President said that the United States leadership "reflects no ambition for world power. It springs from no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of another nation."

Mr. COOLEY. Let me return to this proposition to show that the negotiations are almost concluded. And I pause to say that if we pass this resolution, I would not be a bit surprised if the Mexican officials got up and walked out of the conference. I said before the Rules Committee that I did not see how President Eisenhower could, with good grace, sign this resolution, approve it, knowing that the negotiations were started at his request.

Here is what Mr. Siciliano told me; and I think this was dated March 1:

Our main difficulty now is that we are having trouble in translating the agreement on principles into writing. We have reached an agreement on wages. We are going to set the wages, but to put this agreement in writing is our present difficulty. One thing they have backed away from finally is that they wanted to set the wages. We are willing to give them the right of appeal if they think the wages are too low. Our trouble is now the language difficulty in putting the agreement in writing.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The question I want to ask, Mr. Chairman, is: Does the gentleman agree that this legislation has had the effect of probably stimulating some agreement on the part of Mexico for fear that if they do not get "on the ball" and enter into an agreement, we are going to adopt the same position that Mexico has held? Will the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. COOLEY. That is the same as saying, which everyone here knows to be true, and as the gentleman from Iowa said here yesterday, that this is a

weighted blackjack. You cannot negotiate with friends with a blackjack in your hand, or with a horse pistol in your hand, or with a bullwhip in your hand. If the gentleman thinks he is going to blackjack the Mexicans into an agreement, he is mistaken.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think that we have permitted the Mexicans to dictate to us over the years and that we have had to accept their terms in an emergency?

Mr. COOLEY. I can prove to the gentleman from the lips of Mr. HOPE, of Kansas, the chairman of the committee, who said last year that this bill and these contracts had operated successfully. You have never heard a complaint about them.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But we have not got an agreement. That is what we are asking for now.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is not asking for an agreement. He is asking for a unilateral operation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If they will not give us an agreement; yes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I should like to call attention to the fact that under the immigration and nationality code, the Attorney General of the United States has ample authority under whatever regulations he deems necessary to deal with this very situation. What disturbs me is that if a treaty is not negotiated, then the Attorney General will never get around to working out the sort of an arrangement which has proved so satisfactory in the North, between the United States and Canada. That is the important thing, as I see it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HOPE. I should like to find out from the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], whom I regard as a great authority on immigration law, the answer to this question. It is perfectly true, of course, that the Attorney General can arrange for the admission of these aliens into this country, but he cannot give them the protection that they get under Public Law 78, unless we pass this legislation to permit the program to go into effect. That is the question we are considering today, and the only question.

Mr. WALTER. I do not agree with my distinguished friend at all. If he will look at section 101 and section 214 (a) of the Immigration Code, he will find that it is spelled out because, after all, sitting in on the preparation of this section of the bill was Mr. Fellows of Maine, who had the problem in his State of the Canadian woodsmen coming down temporarily, Senator FERGUSON of Michigan, with the same problem as it related to Windsor and Detroit, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON]. We have always felt that we pointed the way to the Attorney General of the United States, no matter who he is, to work out a decent solution of this problem.

Mr. HOPE. If the gentleman will yield for one moment, I am sure my friend from Pennsylvania is not contending that under the legislation to which he refers the Department of Labor can operate a placement program. That is the question that is involved here, whether they can operate a placement program so as to protect these people as we have been doing in the past.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to address this remark to the lawyers in this House, and I think even the laymen know it, that you cannot have a unilateral agreement. There is no such animal known to legal jurisprudence. Whoever heard of a unilateral agreement? What our officials have done in Mexico is to slam the door on the recruiting offices and to move north of the Rio Grande and to carry on in illegal fashion.

The New York Times published a statement the other day that 100 Communists a day were coming across the border as wetbacks and finding their way into the city districts of this country.

Going back to the negotiations, this is what Mr. White said about it, and this is sent to me from the Mexican Embassy. It is a translation from Excelsior, a paper published in Mexico City:

In a statement made to the press in Monterrey, Ambassador White said that he was hopeful that an agreement on Mexican migratory workers would be reached soon.

Ambassador White stated that the negotiations are being conducted between the two Governments in a spirit of great friendship and understanding.

"We can emphatically state," he added, "that we have made real progress in the negotiations and that we expect soon to reach a definite agreement."

That was back on February 23. They have made much progress since then.

Mr. HOPE. That was after the committee had reported out the joint resolution?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. But it was only after my call to the White House on February 10, before the bill was reported, and after the President had no doubt called Mr. White and insisted on resumption of negotiations that progress was made. Certainly it was not the resolution that prompted the resumption of negotiations; it was directly due to the wish of the President after I had communicated with the White House.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does not contend, then, that we offended the Mexican Government by reporting out this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. No; but you will offend them when you pass this resolution, because it will be the Congress of this great country speaking. Up to then it was only 6 Republicans and 8 Democrats in the committee, but now the Congress is about to act.

Let me go to another thing, and that is the necessity of orderly recruiting. The Mexican Government had insisted on interior recruiting because they knew if they had border recruiting all these workers would flock to the border, as they did, and they would have social problems of great magnitude. They would have thousands of people there without food and shelter, and what

would happen? Mob violence would break loose.

What did happen? Here are some of the headlines:

"Mexican Pact Ends—Recruiting Labor at Border Begins Monday."

That is from El Centro, Calif. Then you have another one from the Imperial Valley Press:

"Near Riot at Border—Mexican Border Violence Erupts."

Another one:

"Unemployed Here Near Postwar Peak."

Here is another:

"Violence Shatters Border Recruiting."

The minute they put border recruiting in—and that is what our officials insisted on—this is what happened:

"Iron Curtain Border Policy Strengthened by Mexicans. Some Brave Guards in Border Jumping."

Here is one. "Thousands of Desperate Mexican Laborers Charge Against Border Gates."

They are doing that by the thousands. "Border Shut Off for Week—Jobless Mob Seek Entry."

"Quota Filled Until Monday—Unemployment Increases 510,000 Over Last Month."

This unemployment is in our own country. Look at the mobs in this picture. Riot guns and tear gas used on these poor, hungry Mexicans who are trying to get in here to earn something by working in the fields of America.

"United States Officers Hurling Back Bracero Mob." Our officers are hurling back the Mexicans, people who want to come over here to work. There are thousands of them.

Here is another headline. "Surprise Predawn Gate Opening Admits Braceros."

"Emergency Police Forces Turn Back Worker Hordes."

Let me stop at this point to tell you that I could go on indefinitely with these headlines. Here is another one.

"Recruitment Full Steam Ahead as Mexico Lifts Iron Curtain."

"Drive Back Bracero Mob—Mexicans Trampled in Rush on Border—Orderly Recruiting Shattered as Milling Throng Makes Break." These are headlines in American papers and these pictures provide convincing evidence why Mexico does not want border recruiting.

Let me turn now to the cost of this program. Do you know what it costs—you economy-minded people? Out of 200,000 contract laborers coming into America last year, 178,000 of the 200,000 went to the landlords of five States. Mark that. The other 22,000 went into 22 other States.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman name the five States?

Mr. COOLEY. The five States are Texas, California, New Mexico, Arizona, and Arkansas. This program cost the taxpayers 2½ million dollars in 1953. In other words, you are subsidizing the big landlords of five States to the tune of 2½ million dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish the Members who were not present yesterday during the debate on the rule would read the two telegrams which I inserted in my remarks at page 2424 of yesterday's Record. One was from Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, who is President Eisenhower's Commissioner on Migratory Labor and the other is from the Texas chairman of the American GI Forum, Mr. Cristobal Aldrete.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope that every Member will read those messages. I came here with the 1951 bill, and frankly I had not studied this bill nor this program as carefully as I have studied the program during the last 30 days. In the last 30 days I have studied every aspect of this legislation. Are we going to support a program that costs the taxpayers \$2½ million to furnish labor for the landlords of five States, when, we in our own country, under our own farm program, and under the proclamation of the Secretary of Agriculture, are taking 30 million acres of fertile farm land out of production of basic agricultural commodities? Where are those workers who tilled those 30 million acres in 1953 going to find jobs? Where are they going to go to make a living? I can show you pictures right now of bread lines right here in this country. I have a picture here showing the main street of Phoenix, Ariz., where they are feeding 1,500 to 1,600 meals a day to idle people. Does that not make an impression on you? Are we going to bring Mexicans in here to take jobs of American workers who are idle and in bread lines? Let us see where this program goes. Look at how ridiculous this program is. Do you know how many Mexican laborers went to the great State of Illinois? Do you know how many of those strong-backed Mexican laborers from Mexico went to Illinois? One hundred and nine. Do you believe that the economy of a State like Illinois depends upon the strength of 109 Mexicans? In the city of Chicago, in the great State of Illinois, they are maintaining a great regional office. And in Ohio, bless your soul, they did not even get a single Mexican. There, too, they are maintaining a regional office in Cleveland. Please explain that to me, if you will? Do you know how many went to the great State of Kansas, the State of my great and beloved chairman—five. Do you mean to tell me that the economy of the State of Kansas depends upon the labor of five Mexicans? Do you know how many went to Wisconsin—eight. I know that the great State of Wisconsin can get along without the labor of eight Mexicans. Now look—there is something "rotten in Denmark"—I do not know what it is, but I think it is our duty to find out.

One hundred and nine in Illinois; Iowa got 96. Now think of the cost of taking a Mexican from the Mexican border out to Wisconsin. Do you believe that any landlord in Wisconsin or Kansas or Illinois is going to pay the fare and maintenance en route for a worker to come from, say, 500 miles south of the

border to go up there to work in those States? Oh, no.

Down in the corner of this chart there is a statement which needs some explanation. "One million nine hundred and thirty-one thousand five hundred and seven meals, including box lunches"—I know you all know what box lunches are, especially you on the left side of the aisle—"box lunches were provided to Mexican agricultural workers by the United States Government, almost 2 million meals."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman tell us who is going to pay for that?

Mr. COOLEY. The people who gave me this chart did not say until I called their attention to it and asked them. We provided in the law that you could charge each landlord \$15 per head to bring the laborer up to the border. The Department has operated that program so as to make a profit. They paid for the meals out of that fund. But do you know what it costs now? They have reduced that \$15 down to \$6 on the average.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will you tell us why they reduced it to \$6?

Mr. COOLEY. Because they found it did not cost \$15.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They were making a profit?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. Even now they have a surplus, but I am anxious to know how these 8 men got up to Wisconsin and these 5 brave Mexicans got all the way up to Kansas. What were they needed for? Do you mean to tell me you cannot find five idle farm workers in the great State of Kansas who are willing to do stoop labor?

These people come across the border in droves, by the thousands. Only 200,000 came over under contract, and I think the record is that a million came over illegally. About 800,000 of them were deported.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I gathered from the gentleman's remarks that the first 20 minutes of his speech was in favor of the continuance of the present operation. Now the last 5 minutes of his speech, he appears to be against the entire thing.

My speech is in two parts and both parts are very vital. In the first place, I want this resolution defeated. In the second place, I want our committee to look into this program from bottom to top and to find out just how it has been operated. I want to know why 5 Mexicans from south of the border went to the great State of Kansas and why 8 Mexicans from south of the border went to Wisconsin, and further, why 96 Mexican workers went to Iowa and only 109 to Illinois. Who paid their way? Did the landlords pay the bill or did Uncle Sam pick up the check? Is our economy so weak that we must depend upon Mexican labor to provide the food and the fiber for our own people?

Until our committee has thoroughly investigated and examined this program, I am perfectly willing for the bilateral program to continue, but I definitely do not want workers from Mexico to take jobs which are wanted and needed by our own unemployed citizens.

I have talked, perhaps too long, but actually I could go on for the rest of the day and into the night. I have not yet heard one sound or logical argument why this resolution should be adopted. I know that the party whip on the left side of the aisle has been used in typical Republican fashion. Perhaps those on the left side of the aisle know why this resolution is so urgent, but, unfortunately, they have not let us in on their great secret.

The passage of this resolution will be unfortunate but the administration wants it and perhaps the administration will have it. What will become of brother Milton's friendly mission to the countries south of the border? Why is the atmosphere at Caracas so hostile? Why is the Mexican Ambassador so concerned? If the passage of this resolution is not wise and in the interest of our good neighbor policy, the decision is that of the administration now in power and the responsibility and the results are attached to those who are responsible for its passage. I know it is unwise; I know it is not right; I know that it will rise up to haunt us in the days ahead. How can it be urgent; how can it be right when our own citizens are unemployed and in bread lines? Mexico has insisted upon a continuation of the contracts made under the old agreement until a new agreement can be negotiated. The arrogance of our Government is calculated to inflame the minds of our friends south of the border. When you offend one member of a family of nations, in a degree you offend all other members of that family of nations. Is there any earthly reason why we should want to offend the people of Mexico?

The only way to cope with the wetback problem is to enforce our immigration laws. The Mexican Government is not willing to make prisoners of their own citizens any more than the American Government is willing to imprison us within the continental confines of our own territory. Mexicans, as Americans, have a right to move from their nation into any other nation in which they desire to go and in which they are accepted. We cannot depend upon Mexico to enforce our own immigration laws. This economy-minded administration has denied the Immigration and Naturalization Service \$3,500,000 which that service deems necessary in the enforcement of our immigration laws. No wonder the border patrol has broken down; no wonder we are unable to enforce our immigration laws; no wonder that 100 Communists are coming across the border every day in the week and in the month as wetbacks and finding their ways into the industries of America. This administration screams about communism and yet it makes no effort to protect our southern border. Because of a limitation of funds the Naturalization and Immigration Service has found

it necessary to take men from Philadelphia, from Baltimore, and from Norfolk to reinforce the border patrol on the Mexican border. This, to be sure, is false economy. Better that we take the \$2,500,000 which is being used to subsidize the landlords of 5 States and use that money to enforce our immigration laws.

We have spent billions rehabilitating the shattered economies of other countries. We have been trying to build friendships around the world. Our storehouses are bulging with vital foods and fibers and yet we are told that there is hunger and distress just south of the Rio Grande. What have we done for Mexico and for the hungry people that live within its borders? There is no real port of entry on that long border that extends for 1,600 or 1,800 miles. The Rio Grande, a narrow brook in the catalogue of rivers, is the port of entry. With our neighbors to the south shall we be arrogant or shall we be friendly? Shall we be exacting or shall we be charitable?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Could you advise the House as to the number of Mexican nationals who are now being utilized to harvest crops which are paid support prices?

Mr. COOLEY. Frankly, most of these Mexicans work with fruits and vegetables. Many of them, however, are engaged in the picking or pulling of cotton. Cotton is about the only crop in which Mexican labor is used that is supported at 90 percent of parity. The other crops involved might be supported at a lower level.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Could the gentleman advise the House approximately how many men were used in harvesting the cotton crop?

Mr. COOLEY. I regret I cannot give the gentleman accurate information as to the number of Mexicans employed in the harvesting of our cotton crop. But in that connection I want to say that I do not believe that any Mexican can make as much as \$15 a day either picking or pulling cotton in the cotton fields of America. In my State of North Carolina I think we pay more for picking cotton than is paid in any of the great cotton-growing States of the Union, and I know that no one person can make \$15 a day picking cotton in North Carolina. If the landlords of the great cotton-producing areas, or if the vegetable producers, or the fruitgrowers of America are willing to pay anything like \$8, \$10, \$12, or \$15 a day for laborers I am positive that American workers by the thousands will flock to the jobs. All this talk about \$15 a day for picking cotton is just a lot of bunk. In this connection, let me remind you of the fact that just about every cottongrower in America will this year reduce his acreage by 33 1/3 percent. So there will not be so much cotton to pick in 1954. Why should the little cotton farmers and taxpayers of the South subsidize a program for the big industrial, mechanized cotton farms in other parts of the country to the tune of \$2,500,000 a year, only to increase our

cotton supply and to put it in storage as a burden on the market and on the Government? If we are "going it alone," let us go it alone for the citizens of America who are willing to work and who want to work in our own fields.

Is this the Eisenhower labor program? Frankly, I believe that it is about all of the labor legislation which will be brought to the floor of this House during this the last session of the 83d Congress. Is this the change the people wanted and voted for? Is this the good-neighbor policy of the present administration? Has any Democratic Secretary of State ridden in a bulletproof and armored car with barbed-wire entanglements and a heavy guard to protect him in a friendly country south of the Rio Grande? Certainly this resolution is not responsible for all the caution which has been provided at Caracas, but there is something mysterious in the atmosphere which we do not know about or understand. South America wants to be friendly. They want to trade with us as neighbors. They feel neglected—and maybe they have been. If our good-neighbor policy is to be a reality, we must be realistic about it.

Now, in conclusion, I repeat: There are two parts to my speech—first, this resolution should be defeated; second, this program should be reexamined and reappraised and perhaps abolished in its entirety.

Throughout the years we have in the Republic of Mexico cultivated the sweet flower of friendship. Let us not now ruthlessly pull the petals from this lovely flower which should flourish through the years to come.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to reply briefly to one or two statements made by my distinguished friend the gentleman from North Carolina which perhaps have left the wrong impression with the Committee. One of those is his statement to the effect that this matter was taken up in an executive session and was expected to be concluded in an executive session without benefit of any hearing.

In reply to my friend I want to call attention to the printed hearings—they are available to all of you—and to point out that it was not an executive session which was held the first day, the day that Mr. Siciliano was present. Every word that was spoken at that meeting was transcribed and is to be found in the hearings. The Chair during the course of the hearings made the statement to the effect that it was not an executive session, and I want to read the statement that the Chair made at that time. I am quoting:

Let the Chair make a statement. Two or three members have asked if this is an executive session. I have told the members who asked that it is not. The press is here. If some of the members do not know that the press is here I am advising them now that there is a representative of the press present.

There was no executive session; and I will say to my distinguished friend

from North Carolina that there was no intention on the part of the chairman at any time to conclude the matter at the session which was held that morning which was called first as an executive session to consider another matter. However, because of the emergency and urgency of this situation the Chair asked the committee to hear Mr. Siciliano in open session, which it did, after which the Chair asked the committee to decide what it wanted to do about the matter, whether to have a further hearing or to take some action on the matter. The committee decided to have further hearings and there were 5 days of additional hearings held on the resolution.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to say to my distinguished friend there was no disagreement between us with reference to the matter which the gentleman is now discussing. I certainly know that my chairman would not have permitted action to be taken on a matter of this kind in a star chamber session or in an executive session.

RECEPTION OF HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

The Committee rose informally.

At 2:14 p. m., the Speaker declared a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving the Governor of Puerto Rico, His Excellency Luis Muñoz-Marín.

At 2:21 p. m. the Speaker called the House to order and the Committee resumed its sitting.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURE WORKERS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make a political speech here today. We are dealing with realities, but I may say very frankly that since the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina has said there are only 8 of these Mexican nationals that came to Minnesota I feel I can speak with impartiality on this subject.

In the first place, I want to employ American labor wherever it is available to work in agriculture and in other pursuits.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not think I have anything to correct. The gentleman stated there were 8 of these Mexican nationals in Minnesota. I do not know where he got his figures.

Mr. COOLEY. I meant in Wisconsin. I stand corrected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman said Minnesota and referred to my name in particular. I have reason to believe that he knows what he is talking about sometimes, but in this case I feel that he is mistaken in what he has told the members of this committee on this important piece of legislation.

As I stated, I want American labor to do our work in the United States if it is available. There may be unemployed something like 3 million people, scattered over the United States. Back in 1949 when we recommended this legislation and put it through Congress under the leadership of the gentleman from North Carolina there were 4,300,000 unemployed in the United States, and none of them would work on the farms in the areas to do stoop labor which is required, which American citizens will not do.

We have had agreements with Mexico. I am hopeful and I am sure that we will have another agreement that will be fair and equitable to our country and Mexico and to the employers of labor, providing not only adequate compensation for the Mexican workers that come into this country but also do justice to the employers of labor and the cost of the program to the Government.

We have heard a great deal mentioned about wetbacks. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has referred to this as the wetback bill. This bill seeks to prevent wetbacks from coming into the United States. We want Mexicans to come in legally. Unless this resolution is passed, these Mexicans who want to come into the United States will come in across the Rio Grande River and they will be wetbacks. If we do not pass this resolution, if we do not enact it into law, there will not only not be an agreement, but our country will be flooded with wetbacks, who will be here illegally. Then we will have another problem, to get them out of this country. There has been reference, too, to the fact that a good many Communists come in from Mexico. I do not know if there is any truth to that; there may be some, but they come in as wetbacks, over the Rio Grande River. They do not come in through the legal channels, the legal ports of entry. This resolution seeks to prevent those wetbacks and those Communists from coming into the United States by having the selected men examined by the Immigration Service, both as to their health and as to their character, to determine whether or not they can come into the United States. If they are found to be unreliable, if it is thought that they might do injury to this country, if they are unhealthy, they are not permitted to come into this country.

We are hoping that there is going to be an agreement with Mexico, but I can assure you this: Unless this resolution is passed, there will not be any fair agreement with Mexico.

It has been said that this bill is used as a blackjack. That has come from the opposition to this legislation. For more than 20 years it has been the policy of our country, up to a year or two ago, to appease every country in the world, to do what they wanted and not what was for the best interests of our country. I think it is high time that we think of the welfare of the American people and have American policies, whether they be bilateral or unilateral.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has made an impassioned plea to you here today to defeat this legislation. He is mistaken in his opinion, and I am sorry to see it. He has

referred to the proceedings of our committee in executive session, which is quite unusual for any member of our committee. He has referred to star-chamber sessions.

I have sat on this committee longer than has the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] or possibly any other man. There may have been star-chamber sessions under his chairmanship of the committee, but not to my knowledge. For him to stand here and accuse the present chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], of conducting star-chamber sessions is uncalled for. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is not warranted in making such accusations.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry; I cannot yield to the gentleman.

Let us pass this legislation. Let us improve our relations with Mexico, because we will be providing the means, the honest means, to secure a satisfactory agreement with the country to the south of us, who are our friends. They understand us best when we are a little firm on those things on which we are trying to negotiate.

We would have been much better off with the entire world had we been firm and stood for America during the past 20 years in negotiating agreements for the benefit of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has made some reference to what he believes to be the attitude of the administration, the executive branch of the Government, with respect to this measure.

Let me say again today, as I said yesterday, that this matter was discussed at the White House last week. It was discussed again Monday morning. I say unequivocally and without any reservation at all that this measure is approved by the administration. There is no difference among the executive departments of the Government with respect to it. I state that as a fact without regard to any question that may be raised about it. I had hoped it would not be necessary to be that blunt about it, but since the question has been raised, perhaps that is the best way to clarify it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I was reporting the conversation I had with the Department of Labor to the effect that Mr. Mitchell had indicated at the White House conference which the gentleman attended yesterday morning at 8:30 that this resolution might be very embarrassing to Mr. Dulles at Caracas. If he did not say that, then I was misinformed.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that Mr. Mitchell was there. The gentleman from North Carolina has been around here long enough to know that I am not going to discuss here on the floor

of the House for the Record the conversations that took place at the White House conference. The gentleman has been very solicitous about the administration's attitude. That is perfectly all right, but I also have a responsibility, and as I said yesterday this measure would not be here today except for the fact that those in primary charge of the conduct of our foreign affairs as well as our interests at home desire this legislation. May I say to the gentleman that Jim Mitchell, Secretary of Labor was there, but I can say also that this legislation is desired and desired at this time for enactment by the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course the gentleman is entirely correct in saying the measure would not be here but for the fact that the administration wants it. I know the gentleman is reporting accurately on the conference. All I said was that there were some misgivings, at least with regard to the possibility of embarrassing Mr. Dulles, and he is my Secretary of State just as much as he is yours. I do not want to see him embarrassed. Now, whether the administration wants it or it does not want it, I want you to tell this House why you want it.

Mr. HALLECK. I pointed out the reason yesterday in my talk on the rule. I am not going to go over it again, but I said that I am supporting this legislation, and I said why I am supporting this legislation. As a matter of fact, apparently everybody on the Committee on Agriculture except the gentleman from North Carolina is out of step. It is not just a matter of the administration wanting this legislation. I would assume that this legislation was initiated here in the Congress because we have been acting upon this sort of legislation for years and years. What I am saying is that so far as the administration is concerned and so far as any embarrassing of Mr. Dulles is concerned, and so far as the conduct of our foreign affairs is concerned, it should be understood here without any question that this legislation should proceed to enactment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the former vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], for 4 minutes, and I regret that I cannot yield any more time to him.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman does not regret any more than I do that he cannot yield me more than 4 minutes because my distinguished former chairman, and good friend, has undoubtedly been so effective in his argument that I fear that some of our colleagues may have felt that he was speaking for the Democratic membership of the Agriculture Committee. Actually, there was no political division on this bill. More Democrats voted for it than Republicans. Only one other member of the committee joined the gentleman from North Carolina in opposition.

Ordinarily, this measure would have attracted little attention. It has become so important because it has been blown

up into something of tremendous magnitude by those who, doubtless in all good faith, have been seeing "boogers." The bill has been completely misunderstood. Unfortunately, there is little time in which to try to clear up those misunderstandings.

This bill is but an effort to continue the basic policy which we adopted several years ago. It is based upon the belief that it is sound for the United States to try to work out a program which will not only provide the United States with needed agricultural labor, but which will give to the citizens of a friendly Republic a degree of opportunity and protection which we, in the larger nation, feel we should afford to these workers. There have been a lot of tears shed at this microphone in behalf of these workers and particularly those who are wetbacks. I want to call to your attention the fundamental problem of the wetbacks, which is simply a question of economics. In the Republic of Mexico a farm laborer can ordinarily make less working all day long from sun to sun than he will make in 1 hour when he crosses that river just a few miles to the north. Those people down there are human beings just like you and me. They have families. They are good, hardworking people. They feel responsible for supporting their families, and they make a serious effort to support them. They are going to cross the border just like water is going to run downhill. Is it any wonder that these people throng to the border, seeking to cross, seeking the fabulous wages that are paid on the northern side? What would you do if you were in their situation? I think I would cross the border just as they do—legally if they can—illegally if we refuse to provide any other method. The difference will be that if we do not pass this bill and we do not have any contract program, then they come without any protection whatever. They will accept any employment offered them—at any wage and under any living conditions so long as it seems that the immigration officers won't be likely to find them.

These Mexican workers need the little protection which a contract can afford them. They need it far more than we need it, but we must insist that if there is to be a contract that it be reasonable. I feel that the Mexican Government has insisted on some very unreasonable provisions. For instance, they have refused to allow any border recruitment. They have said that all of the workers must come from the interior of Mexico. I recognize Mexico's problems. I realize that a program which recruited all the workers from the border would be unfair. On the other hand, if all the workers are recruited in the interior, the Mexican workers who live along the border are going to continue to cross, illegally, and we will have done little to relieve the wetback problem. I should think those who oppose this bill would want to join with us in correcting this situation. The answer should be a compromise with, not a surrender to, Mexico.

Let all those who claim to be interested in the welfare of these Mexican citizens, let them explain how they would take care of these Mexicans—how, without a

contract, they would make sure that these workers will get wages promised them. I challenge the next speaker, if there are others who are opposed to this bill—I know of only one. But if there be any other opponent, let him explain to you not the dire plight of the Mexican wetback, which we all recognize, but just how he and the other opponents of this bill expect to improve that plight. Would he agree with the Mexican Government that the Mexican farmer who lives just south of the border should be denied the employment opportunities which are offered to the taxi driver from the city of Mexico? Would he oppose all contract workers? If so, what will he say to the American worker who wants a job? Not one single Mexican worker can come in under this bill until the United States Department of Labor has found that there are no American citizens who want the jobs. How do these opponents of this legislation propose to protect American labor?

Oh, they say those of us who support this bill want cheap labor. If we simply wanted to exploit the Mexican people, we would want to see all this orderly program destroyed. Then we could indeed mistreat those unfortunate wetbacks who would never dare to take their trouble to the officials because of fear of deportation.

We offer you an orderly method of employment under the law. Unless we give some alternative, the only other way for those people to come over is to let them come and be subject to all the exploitation of which the opponents of this bill have told you. In all sincerity I tell you that this is not a bill merely for the benefit of the employers in five States. It is a bill for the benefit of the citizens of a friendly republic. It is a bill for the benefit of the laboring people of the United States. It is a bill to protect human rights. Those of you who are interested in protecting human rights and who oppose this bill, should at least have the frankness to tell us just how you propose to see that those rights are protected. We offer you a program of Government-supervised contract labor. What do you offer? I challenge the next one who is going to get up here, not to talk about wetbacks, but to talk about how you are going to keep people from being wetbacks; how you are going to give some legal recourse to those people; how you are going to protect American workers from unfair competition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to place myself in the same position as my good friend from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. He is an older Member and has served longer on the Committee on Agriculture than have I. No better friend or no better working friend than Mr. POAGE have I had or expect to have in the Committee on Agriculture. We have worked together on subcommittees. We have worked together in the Committee of the Whole. We have cooperated on all problems that arise in the area which he represents, which is a great deal of the

Southwest, as well as serious agricultural problems that sometimes affect the area that I personally represent. So I am proud to follow him on this occasion, especially when I know how much he really knows about this legislation.

As he told you—and he was very excellent in that statement that he made to the Rules Committee—when he explained that this was not a bill that has any concern whatsoever with the wetback problem; let us be sure that is plain in everybody's mind.

Then, to my friend, the ranking member on the minority side on the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I agree with him when he said our committee tries to operate in a nonpartisan way. We have.

Now, in the not too far distant future we will have legislation on this floor that will probably affect production areas of every part of this United States. I hope and I pray that that legislation will come out of our committee nonpartisan.

But let me call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] to a little statement he made about the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

This statement was made when the ranking minority member who has spoken at length this afternoon and created a lot of smoke—he does not tell us where the fire is—the only difference is that this time, this moment, he is opposing this bill and at that time when he was my chairman he was all for supporting this legislation.

Now, I have not any way to know what sort of elements he has in his mind that have caused this change of stand shown in what he said about my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], when he was carrying the burden of chairmanship of the subcommittee dealing with this question:

I do not suppose you could find 30 better Americans than the 30 members of the House Committee on Agriculture.

That, of course, included the gentleman from North Carolina as well.

And certainly every member of our committee is not only interested in farmers and farm problems but is likewise interested in American laboring men and in the general welfare of all our people. Certainly no American landlord would prefer to give work to an alien in preference to a citizen, nor is it reasonable to believe that American employers of farm labor would be willing to incur the expense and to assume the risk incident to bringing in foreign labor if local labor were available.

Let us start this discussion by realizing the urgent need for importing Mexicans to do a job which otherwise will not be done.

Now, listen to the rest of it. He calls attention to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to say this without attempting to discuss the details of the measure before you, that I do hope you will listen as it is discussed. I again urge you to listen to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the chairman of the subcommittee that conducted the hearings. He understands all of the problems here presented. If you will listen to him as he pre-

sents the bill I think you can vote more intelligently.

Now, just who is standing for this bill? What about the departments? I hold in my hand committee reports, and I see some of you have looked at them. But you will find that report signed by a man who served 6 years in this House, a man most of you know. The gentleman I refer to is now Assistant Secretary of State, Thruston Morton. Here is what he says:

The Department of State strongly favors the enactment of this joint resolution. * * * It is also felt that the likelihood of achieving a satisfactory agreement with Mexico will be improved if it can be shown that the United States is capable of exercising reasonably satisfactory controls by itself.

Further he states:

The Department of State will continue its efforts to achieve an agreement responsive to the best interests of the various affected sectors of the United States economy and of our national security, as well as those of the Mexican worker. These efforts will be appreciably assisted by passage of the legislation under consideration.

That is signed "Thruston B. Morton" and is dated February 5, 1954.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Let me finish my statement.

In addition to that I have a statement from the Attorney General. I will not read it.

Then, I also call your attention to the statement of True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture; and in addition to that the Labor Department brought before our committee their top man and supported this legislation, which every one of you may be able to discover by just taking a glance at the printed report of the hearings.

In closing let me tell you that all this legislation does is to provide a method, a manner, a means of bringing Mexican laborers into these United States and grant them the privilege to remain in this country in areas where the Secretary of Labor declares there is a deficiency and that it is impossible to secure farm labor.

It is stiff and nonsense to think that because Colorado has 3,000 of these laborers that we do not need this legislation. The answer is, We get more of the Spanish-American people from New Mexico, Arizona, and even Texas, if there is plenty of labor in that area; but if the labor tightens up in Texas, if the labor tightens up in California, Arizona, and New Mexico, we would not be able to get along without these extra folks who come into our area. So just because the State of Wisconsin or Michigan or some other State has only 5 or 10 or 15 Spanish-American people, that is no reason in the world why anyone should make the statement that we do not need them. We need them in Colorado because our people will not do this stoop labor; there is no question about that, and I am not finding fault with them because they will not do the stoop labor. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] told you, these Mexicans get much more money for an hour's labor up here than they can get in Mexico for a day's labor, so why should they not come into the United

States and do this stoop labor? They save their money and they go back down to Mexico with their money and supply their families with much-needed food and other necessities that greatly improve their economic condition, and they should be protected by the Government of Mexico in doing this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have known Spanish-American workers who have attended schools under my teaching. A finer group of boys and girls I never had. But I know the life of those folks. I know the life and the surroundings from which they come. As stated by the gentleman who was blowing a lot of hot air around that would not even smoke if you put dynamite under it, these men face a terrible condition when they come into this country to work. I said, "All right, I will accept that, but you go down into Mexico and bring me the picture back as to the conditions under which their families exist in Mexico." He said he would get it for the record, but as yet he never provided it for the record because he probably has not been closer to Mexico than the north borderline of the State of California.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDON].

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the resolution allowing the United States unilaterally to make arrangements with individual Mexican nationals for work in the United States. I do so because I feel that such an act is unwise in the absence of an agreement with the Republic of Mexico. When the measure came up in the first session of this Congress, pursuant to the bilateral agreement between the two governments, I voted for the bill. I had some misgivings as to the desirability of this method of recruitment, but I felt that a showing had been made that the labor was necessary, and that the rights of the individuals involved were protected by the agreement between our country and our neighbor to the south. Such an agreement, however, has not been negotiated for the forthcoming year. From statements made on the floor, it appears that negotiations are now going on, and there is every likelihood that some form of agreement may be reached. I feel that by passing this legislation now, we will offset these negotiations by providing machinery for unilateral action on our part and disregarding the legitimate interests of the Mexican Government.

I feel that at a time when our world relationships and particularly those in Latin America seem to be deteriorating, we should not take action which will give offense to the very proud countries in Central and South America. Moreover, I feel that in the absence of an agreement in which the Republic of Mexico has a definite interest, there may be a possibility for a deterioration of the working conditions and wages of the persons who would come across the border.

Finally, I am impressed with the reasoning of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] that we may be creating a situation in which the Republic of Mexico under international law could refuse to allow these Mexican nationals to return to that country. If the Republic of Mexico took this course, it seems to me we would not be in a position to deport these individuals after their term of service is up. Obviously, they would have been legally admitted to the United States, and therefore the grounds for deportation may not exist in the absence of the acceptance by the Republic of Mexico of these persons at the end of the contract period.

For these reasons, I am joining with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] in opposing the measure.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate on this bill. I listened to the testimony given in the hearings and I have tried to weigh this matter objectively. I can do so because we do not use any of this labor in Florida. It is my conclusion that virtually every argument that has been made against this bill is in reality a logical argument in favor of the passage of it.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Does the gentleman know how many witnesses appeared in opposition to this resolution?

Mr. HERLONG. My recollection is that there were three witnesses who appeared in opposition to the bill.

Mr. FISHER. Who did they represent? From what source does the opposition to this bill come?

Mr. HERLONG. They were, of course, the labor organizations.

Mr. FISHER. Were there any witnesses in opposition to the measure except the CIO and the AFL or certain segments of them, and somebody representing a local union out in California that is endeavoring to organize the farmers out there?

Mr. HERLONG. Not that I recall.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the gentleman if Mr. Thomas, who represented the CIO and who seemed to be spearheading the opposition to this measure before the committee, made any statement as to whether he is for or against the processing of Mexican labor to work on this side regardless of whether we are or are not in agreement with Mexico?

Mr. HERLONG. It is my recollection that he was opposed to bringing any over here, whether or not there was an agreement.

Mr. FISHER. In other words, while he made a very lengthy tirade against this proposal, he finally ended up by saying that he was opposed to the use of Mexican nationals on this side of the border, whether they came in legally or illegally, or whether there was an agreement or no agreement; is not that so?

Mr. HERLONG. That is my recollection, yes.

Mr. FISHER. On the contrary, I should like to ask the gentleman if the American Farm Bureau supported this, for the record.

Mr. HERLONG. Yes, all the farm organizations who took any position at all on it, supported it.

Mr. FISHER. Did the National Grange also endorse it?

Mr. HERLONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. FISHER. Did the National Farmers Cooperative endorse it?

Mr. HERLONG. They did.

Mr. FISHER. And did the National Cotton Council endorse it?

Mr. HERLONG. They did.

Mr. FISHER. And did not more than a score of farm organizations in California who are dependent upon this labor in order to harvest their crops also endorse it?

Mr. HERLONG. There was a whole raft of them who did.

Mr. FISHER. All the responsible people who know anything at all about this issue who appeared before the committee endorsed it?

Mr. HERLONG. That was the impression that I got.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I should like to clarify a few of the things which have been said in connection with this resolution. Of course, the impression that the Government is spending a lot of money because of this resolution is fallacious because actually the Government will be spending more money unless we do bring these Mexican laborers in legally rather than have them come in illegally; because, when they are brought in legally the employer pays the expense of returning them if they leave their work or break their contract. In fact, he posts a bond to guarantee the payment of this cost if the Government is forced to apprehend the "skip."

Another thing I think should be made specifically clear is that this Mexican labor, which is imported only for agricultural purposes, will not be brought in unless there is a certificate of necessity from the Department of Labor. There has to be a need for this labor. The certificate is issued only after all available domestic labor supplies have been exhausted.

I hate to take issue with the former chairman of my committee, a man with whom I have worked in harmony through the years that I have had the opportunity of being a member of the Committee on Agriculture; but I think that he has left some impressions here today which would confuse the average person. Again I would say that if we do not pass this resolution, we will be agreeing in principle that we are willing for the Mexican Government to dictate all of the provisions under which this labor comes into the United States. I should much prefer that we do have an agreement with Mexico, even if it is the same agreement that we have had in the past. But if we cannot get such an agreement, then I think that it is reasonable to adopt this resolution. On the other hand, I say that the failure to pass this resolution, or the defeat of this resolu-

tion, will not stop wetbacks coming into the United States. I think that the failure to pass this resolution will even increase the number of wetbacks who come into the United States and will create a greater expense, and at the same time will prevent the employer of legal Mexican labor from securing the labor which he needs.

In my area of the country we have some unemployment at this time; but I can assure this House that when the cotton chopping season comes, we are not going to have any unemployment. We are going to need some additional labor in order to cultivate and harvest that crop.

I have no desire whatsoever to do anything which would in my opinion reduce the opportunity for employment of any American citizen. Actually, while the Mexican labor does not receive wages in excess of those paid to domestic labor, the employer, through the payment of transportation costs, insurance, bond, and fringe benefits which are required under the contract, is forced to pay more for the labor performed by Mexicans than that performed by American citizens, and for that reason most employers—farmers—do not use Mexican labor except in emergencies and when local labor is not available and when other domestic labor cannot be provided by the United States Employment Service. I feel that this issue has been confused more than necessary because of some of the statements which were made by our former chairman. I think the gentleman from Colorado hit the nail on the head when he said that we should follow the advice of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who is possibly as well acquainted with the situation as any other person.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] was in gross error when he said to this House that this joint resolution was a mere continuation of the policy that has been in operation since 1948?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not going to argue that point with the gentleman. I will say this, however, that if you defeat this resolution here today I think you are going to contribute to the entrance of more wetbacks and you are going to make it more difficult to reach the agreement on which the people from our Nation and the friendly nation of Mexico are now working. I think we all want to see that agreement consummated, and I think that the introduction and reporting of this resolution have had a salutary effect. I think that possibly the agreement will be consummated largely because of this resolution and not in spite of it as has been suggested by some of the opponents.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be repetitious. This is a sound piece of legislation. It is being asked for by the administration. It has

the approval of the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, and the Attorney General of the United States. It is a constructive piece of legislation.

It has been very well pointed out that this legislation is necessary to meet the stoop labor situation in the United States. It presents an orderly way of handling the wetback problem, as has been emphasized time and time again. We can either have the problem of the wetbacks continuously or we can try to do something about it. These wetbacks have been coming across the Rio Grande and into this country without much restriction. They have been creating a real problem. Under the terms of the resolution now before us, these Mexicans will come into the United States in accordance with the law. I am sure that is what the American people want done.

I am not particularly concerned because only some 96 of these Mexican laborers were employed in the State of Iowa. That is completely beside the point. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I see it as my duty to legislate for agriculture in the 48 States of the Union.

We are confronted with a very practical problem. I think you well know that the labor involved here relates to the so-called stoop labor, getting down on the ground and pulling vegetables out of the ground and pulling weeds out of the ground, and doing this stoop labor is the kind of work which the ordinary American laboring man simply refuses to do.

I certainly am in favor of using American labor in every instance where it can be done. When we get to the point where we cannot recruit from the labor pool in this country the men that are needed to harvest the perishable crops then it is our duty to find ways and means to get these crops harvested.

As for me, I do not want food of any kind to go to waste. I think it is highly essential that our vegetable and fruit crops be harvested when they are ready to be harvested. Unless vegetables and fruits are harvested within a certain set time they may rot on the ground.

Now a word about the negotiations with Mexico. I am in favor of continuing the agreements with the Republic of Mexico. The negotiations of the past weeks and months have been rather one-sided affairs. We could not come to agreement with the Mexican authorities because they were arbitrary in their demands. They were insisting, among other things, that they had the right to fix the minimum wage rates in the United States, well knowing that there was no minimum wage for agricultural workers in the United States.

I think the members of the committee should also know that the Mexican Government was insisting that the insurance policies covering the Mexican workers be channeled through one particular insurance company. There is ample reason why the American negotiators were not willing to meet such unreasonable demands.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. We who are affected in our area appreciate the attitude of the gentleman. We want to do everything we can to be fair with Mexico and to be friendly with Mexico, but we should not go so far as to become paralyzed on an occasion like this for fear of offending our sister republic of Mexico.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am very happy to have the gentleman's comment. In fact, the gentleman took the words out of my mouth. I cannot quite see why Members of the Congress of the United States should be so unduly concerned about the welfare of the people of foreign countries, and not be as fully concerned about the welfare of our own people.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? What was that word—"mulish"? Did the gentleman say mulish Members of Congress?

Mr. HOEVEN. I did not make such a statement. I said unduly concerned, nothing else. There was a stalemate in the negotiations with the Republic of Mexico up to the very time the Committee on Agriculture started hearings on the resolution now being considered. When we got busy the Mexican Government got busy and now they are ready to negotiate some more. The passage of this resolution will help the negotiations rather than harm them.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to observe that my distinguished friend from Iowa made a grave mistake when he said that the State of Iowa received 97 workers. Actually, Iowa received 96. I am just wondering if the gentleman is willing to support a program that costs the American taxpayers \$2½ million a year in order to get 96 workers in the State of Iowa to save the agricultural economy of the great State of Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How many did the State of Michigan get?

Mr. COOLEY. Two thousand five hundred and sixty-eight.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How many?

Mr. COOLEY. Two thousand five hundred and sixty-eight.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, we have hundreds of them.

Mr. HOEVEN. How many did the State of North Carolina get?

Mr. COOLEY. The State of North Carolina did not get nor did the State of North Carolina need or want a single one.

Reference has been made to the endorsement of this resolution by the leading farm organizations of America. Yes, it is a fact. The American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange sent to our committee very brief and feeble endorsements. Frankly, I doubt if those who prepared and presented the endorsements really understood the purpose of the resolution. Be that as it may, the fact remains that according to press reports these great organizations and other great farm organizations later held a two-day meeting here in the city

of Washington and finally concluded that "farm leaders hold Golden Rule is vital." Here is a quotation from the Washington Post dated February 25, 1954:

On the wetback issue, three United States farm organizations and the Mexican farm organization represented at the conference unanimously agreed that the question should be handled through an international agreement.

These groups promised to work to facilitate an agreement by their governments. They were the Asociacion Nacional de Cosecheros of Mexico and the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Grange. The National Farmers Union was represented by its president, James Patton, at the Tuesday morning conference but did not participate in later meetings.

Allan B. Kline, AFBF president, is also president of the IFAP and presided at the sessions.

Even though the record discloses the feeble endorsements that I have referred to, the press report clearly indicates that the leaders of these great organizations, when they really understood the proposition, decided that Mexican labor should be recruited as contemplated by the law which has been on the books since 1948 and as it was revised or amended in 1951. So it is plain to see that not only are all of the labor organizations of America opposed to this resolution but likewise all of the great farm organizations of America are also opposed to this slam-the-door, go-it-alone program. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we may be realistic about this very important matter and appreciate fully the delicate diplomatic implications involved.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I do not come to the well of this House today to qualify as a witness speaking to the question as to whether these workers are needed. I am perfectly willing to take the word of my colleagues who represent those districts where these workers are used. I was impressed at the beginning of the hearings on this particular resolution with the fact that we had reams and reams of testimony previously taken, coming from essentially the same sources that a repetition of it came from when we opened the doors to them again. So I would like to address my remarks for an instant or two to the reasons for the opposition that has appeared on the floor of this House to this legislation. It seems to be an uncontroverted fact that these Mexicans are needed; that they are coming. Therefore, if they are here they are going to work. I want them to work legally.

When we began the hearings on this legislation the ranking Democrat on this committee, whom you have heard at some length this afternoon, insisted that he thought a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture was much better qualified to negotiate an agreement between this Government and the Government of Mexico than were the representatives of the executive department. He insisted that he felt that the chairman of our great committee should send a subcommittee to Mexico City in order

to negotiate this agreement. The chairman of the committee, very wisely in my opinion, felt that the Members of the Congress had no business in Mexico City attempting to usurp the prerogatives of the executive department, regardless of how long it had been since certain Members had been on an extended tour. In confirmation of that particular position, I was astounded later on in the hearings by having the ranking Democrat on our committee insist that representatives of the Department of Labor tell the committee in open public hearings exactly the points on which this sovereign Government would yield. Finally, I was glad to see that this committee, in direct divergence from action taken by some committees in this Congress in recent years, decided that for once representatives of this Government should have their hands upheld.

Many crocodile tears have been shed in the well of this House over some supposed unilateral action that might come from this Government if this resolution is adopted. The testimony makes abundantly clear that there have been hundreds and hundreds of instances where the agents of Mexico have employed unilateral actions, even in spite of contracts that existed.

Now, if you want to help solve the wetback problem, if you want to help keep wetbacks out of this country, you vote to adopt this resolution. The reason for the opposition that came from the well of the House was very obvious to me, because it came at the instance of two labor organizations. The reason for their opposition was obvious, it being based on the fact that they could not demand organizational dues from those Mexican workers, because if they did it would violate the contract under which the Mexicans work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, we have had a very interesting and constructive debate this afternoon on this bill.

Mr. POAGE, of Texas, and Mr. HILL, of Colorado, made especially eloquent and interesting speeches.

It is hard for me to understand why there should be so much misunderstanding on this proposal to bring into the United States Mexican nationals to help harvest the fabulous crops of California and other Western States, especially those which rely on irrigation.

The ones who profit most from this operation, I think, are the Mexican workers. By that I mean they profit most financially when it is considered how much they are paid in Mexico and what they are paid by the ranchers who hire them in California. But we also profit greatly by this operation because it enables California ranchers to harvest the fabulous crops which we grow in our State. What I wish our eastern friends could understand is that if we do not get the laborers to help us harvest these crops that the prices to the consumer will be increased because of a scarce crop.

For instance, now, in my area asparagus is ready to be harvested. Six hundred workers are required right now to help harvest this crop and 600 more will be required in several weeks. This applies to all other crops such as celery, potatoes, onions, cherries, and so forth.

There have been so many excellent speeches showing the need for this bill that there is nothing I can add. The Committee on Agriculture of the House was practically unanimous that this measure should be passed at once. Its recommendations have always been sound and its recommendation in this instance is no exception.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, we have only one other speaker on this side.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I am somewhat surprised by the speech which has just been made by my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER]. His speech prompts me to say that for 4 long years I was chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture. In each term of Congress this House made available to our committee the sum of \$50,000, and this House without a dissenting vote passed the resolution which authorized our committee to meet at any time, whether Congress was in session or not, and at any place inside or outside of the United States. If that resolution did not take in the entire world I do not know how the entire world could have been taken in. Yet during that entire time, for 4 years while I was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I did not go to Mexico at the expense of the taxpayers of America. During the time that I was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I sent subcommittees to Mexico; I sent subcommittees to many parts of our own great country, and at least one subcommittee to Europe. At my direction, and pursuant to the resolution I have just mentioned, I requested and required the members of our committee to use Government facilities on a nonreimbursable basis and on a space-available basis—the ships and planes and other facilities owned and operated by our Government, and, as a result of all of this, my recollection is we turned back into the Treasury of the United States during the first 2 years more than \$28,000 of the \$50,000 which this House had made available to our committee. In the next 2 years we did just about the same thing, and, my recollection is, we turned back more than one-half the money which you had appropriated for us. Mr. Chairman, my recollection is further to the effect that I did not travel with any of the subcommittees to any place inside or outside of the United States except on one occasion I did meet one of the subcommittees investigating the terminal markets in the city of New Orleans and perhaps on one other occasion I met with members of our committee in the city of Memphis.

Mr. Chairman, had I really wanted to travel even to the far-distant parts of the world, for 4 long years I could have gone at the expense of the taxpayers, but this, Mr. Chairman, I did not do. The record of expenditures is over yonder in the House Office Building and certainly those records are open for the

scrutiny and inspection of the gentleman from Georgia. I shall be glad to put the expenditures of our committee up against the expenditures of any other committee of this Congress. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am certainly surprised at the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia.

Why is not the gentleman from Georgia willing to meet the issue here presented forthright and head on and argue the merits of the proposition here presented? The answer to that question is obvious. He has no argument.

During the time that I was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and when that committee had the authority and the money I have just referred to, and at a time when the officials of our Government were negotiating an agreement with the Government of Mexico, two Members of Congress, Senator ALLEN JOSEPH ELLENDER, of Louisiana, a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and my distinguished and beloved colleague W. R. POAGE, of Texas, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, actually went to Mexico as advisers to our team of negotiators. During the hearings on this joint resolution, and after being thoroughly convinced that we had no team of negotiators in Mexico, and after I had been further convinced that no real effort had been made to compose differences and to reach an agreement, I merely suggested, in our committee room, that it might be a good idea for some members, perhaps one or two from each of the committees, that is, of the Senate and the House, to go to Mexico and to supplement the feeble efforts of those who had been charged with the great responsibility of negotiating a new agreement. At the time I made the suggestion I know that the chairman of our committee, the very distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] had no authority to send a member of our committee outside of our country, nor did he have money available to him to defray the expenses incident to such a mission. If you will examine the transcript you will see that at the very time I made the suggestion I said I had never been into the interior of Mexico and I had no desire to go there now. I made the suggestion only to emphasize the fact that I believe that reasonable men could compose the differences.

I stated before the Rules Committee that I thought that any five members of that great committee could take charge of the negotiations and could come to an agreement. I am more than ever convinced that the officials of our Government laid down an ultimatum and then came home. In effect, they said, you will do it our way or you will not do it at all.

If you will examine the record you will not find even the names of the negotiators. I challenge anyone even now to give me the name of any official of our Government who has even spoken to an official of the Government of Mexico, except perhaps to the Ambassador from Mexico, who is residing right here in the city of Washington. The whole problem was turned over to our Ambassador to Mexico, Mr. White. When the

negotiations broke down and were terminated, officials of our Government sought to establish an illegal program which was finally declared illegal by the great Comptroller General on February 2 in the good year of our Lord 1954.

Prompted by the hope of President Eisenhower, and, no doubt, at his request, negotiations were resumed on the night of February 10. The negotiations are now in progress and fortunately great progress has been made. Everything now indicates that within the next few days all controversies will be composed and an agreement will be reached. Why should we interfere with those negotiators by passing this resolution which very well might be considered as an insult to the officials of the Government of Mexico?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, it is rather unfortunate, I think, that personalities have been permitted to enter into this discussion, because what we have here at stake is a very important problem; it is important to the economy of great sections of our country.

I am supporting this resolution and I do so wholeheartedly. I have supported similar legislation in the past.

The question has been raised here as to whether or not the American Farm Bureau is in support of this legislation. I wish to read from a letter which was addressed to our chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], February 19 of this year concerning House Joint Resolution 355. This is the pertinent paragraph:

The American Farm Bureau very strongly supports the enactment of House Joint Resolution 355. As you know we recommended early consideration of the matter by your committee. We testified in favor of the bill. We have urged the House Rules Committee to expedite the granting of a rule. We have urged the Senate Agriculture Committee to expedite their consideration of a similar Senate resolution. We have recommended to the Senate majority leader that the Senate resolution be cleared for early action by the Senate.

I think that should in very conclusive fashion set to rest any question that might have arisen in your mind with regard to this particular matter.

Just briefly in conclusion I may say this, that in my State and also in Michigan because it is a seasonal proposition, many of these Mexicans, both citizens of the State of Texas as well as Mexican nationals do come up for seasonal work. They come into Indiana for a short season, go on up to Michigan, then they come back again for the harvest season. Primarily they come into Indiana for the tomato harvest season and in this respect they are invaluable; in fact, if we are to get this great tomato harvest in the pack it is absolutely essential that we do have them. They are dependable, and I would like to say here and now that we in Indiana have had none but the finest contacts and dealings with these people. They have represented in my opinion an excellent type of citizenship, and we are proud to have them there. We are very happy also to tell you that many of those same families

have been coming to our community for several years. We see those who started coming to Indiana many years ago have improved their economic status to where they are able to maintain themselves at a higher standard of living and some are people of very substantial means. So I think it is important to remember that in this problem the people who are participating, whether they are citizens of Texas or Mexican nationals, are and have been profiting by this opportunity. Certainly I know that we in Indiana have been delighted to have them. They have come to my home county and they have rendered a very valuable service.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Let me point out to the gentleman that you did not get a single one of them in Indiana. How can the gentleman receive them so cordially when the record shows that Indiana did not get a single one?

Mr. HARVEY. I do not know where the gentleman got his statistics, but I live in Indiana and I know they come there.

Mr. COOLEY. This is from the Labor Department.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 501 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949," approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461-1468), as amended, is further amended by striking out the parenthetical clause "(pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico or after every practicable effort has been made by the United States to negotiate and reach agreement on such arrangements)."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on this bill as one who is familiar with it from personal experience because on rare occasions when no other source of labor is available I have hired Mexican nationals on my ranch in California.

I would like to point out some of the facts regarding the unusual situation which prevails in my native State of California. In the first place, as you probably know, our State raises 212 commercial crops. To be commercial a crop must be in interstate or foreign commerce and it must bring \$1 million into the State of California; otherwise it is not classified as commercial.

Our State of California produces 8 percent of the agricultural wealth of the United States and uses 7 percent of the agricultural labor. In the last 4 years, the most recent 4 years, we have produced \$2 billion in new agricultural

wealth, yet in the last 100 years our gold industry in the State of California has produced less than \$1 billion in new wealth.

In our State we plant and harvest a crop every month of the year. We raise crops on land at elevations of 5,000 feet on down to 250 feet below sea level. We raise them in temperatures that vary from 120 degrees to freezing in any month of the year.

I point out these facts to show that California has a different situation. Mechanization is not possible in our State as it is in others.

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to come down to a very basic point which has been involved in this debate today. That is the question, Is there a shortage of agricultural labor? With in excess of 3 million unemployed how can there be a labor shortage? I admit to you very frankly that in our State of California there is unemployment, but I point out that those who are currently unemployed are not qualified to perform agricultural labor nor do they have the desire to engage in it.

Agricultural labor, believe it or not, is skilled labor. For example, may I point out the operation involved in the thinning of sugar beets which is currently going on at this very moment on my ranch in California. I am paying \$16 an acre for thinning sugar beets. A good experienced sugar-beet thinner can thin an acre in 10 hours. His salary is, therefore, \$1.60 an hour. We plant sugar beets on hills or beds which are 40 inches apart and we plant two rows to each hill or bed. That means that there are 26,162 running feet row in each acre. We try to leave 160 beets every 100 feet when we are performing this thinning operation. That means that this man, this skilled laborer I am going to call him, must strike the ground with his short-handled hoe 15,697 times to earn that \$16 or \$1.60 an hour. If he thins the acre in 10 hours, that means he hits the ground with that hoe 1,570 times each hour or 27 strokes per minute, or once every 2.2 seconds.

Visualize this beet thinner. He cannot get down on his knees because he is progressing forward at a rate of 12 to 14 feet a minute. He is standing in a stooped position, reaching to the ground, chopping every 2.2 seconds. And he must be very careful to hit the ground as close to that beet seedling as he possibly can, so that the many beet seedlings which are intertwined will be exposed. And while he is doing that with his right hand, his left index finger and thumb are working with the deftness of a surgeon, going in to untwine those intertwined beets, removing the weak ones and leaving only the strong ones and leaving only one single beet every 8 inches.

I point out that operation to you, Mr. Chairman, to show you that this is not just ordinary labor; it is skilled labor.

There is unemployment in California. Go to the unemployment insurance lines and you will see it. But go to those lines and ask those men if they will accept a job thinning beets, hitting that ground 1,570 times per hour for \$16 an acre, and they will tell you, "We won't do it."

And furthermore, if you try them you will find that they cannot do it.

I maintain that the persons in the unemployment insurance lines or the people who are unemployed in California and the other States are not agricultural laborers. They are not qualified to do this work. They do not have the desire to do it.

As I explained in a debate on this subject last year, we prefer to hire local labor because local laborers are more experienced and because the incidental costs of local labor are not as high as for Mexican nationals.

Let me quote from a letter which I received from one of my growers in California, a heavy producer of broccoli:

They call the Mexican national program slavery. In some areas of the Nation this might be true, but why penalize California and Arizona? We must pay these nationals the going rate of pay for such labor as we pay the locals. Then we must furnish camp facilities, power, water, heat, kitchen, cooks, transportation, medical treatment, transportation to and from the border, association fees, and countless other expenses. Our cost for this program brings the hourly rate to \$1.19 per hour per man. We can hire locals, if available, for 95 cents to \$1 per hour and furnish none of the above. Obviously, it would be sound business to hire locals, but there's one catch—there are none, or very few, who are willing to work in the fields. Those who used to work in canneries have gone to industrial employment; those who used to work the fields have gone to the canneries and industry. You have no one to replace the field worker except the "wineos." For 3 years now we have had standing orders for 60 men per year from the farm labor office, and in the whole 3 years they have been unable to furnish us 60 men total.

I quote from another letter received from a large producer of strawberries. He says:

Domestic labor here has never been successful because the majority of available domestic workers are not accustomed and have no desire for the type of stoop labor that is necessary for strawberry harvest.

Another large producer of strawberries says:

While it is true that there may be local unemployment, none of our local people will do stoop labor. In hundreds of cases people are sent out from employment offices with cards, requesting us to sign their cards showing no jobs, in order that they may go back on unemployment relief. Whether we sign the card or not, in 75 percent of the instances they will not attempt the work. Those that will try, generally will last only a day or two.

Here in another letter is the case of a farmer in my district who wanted to hire local labor, so he went to the local farm-labor office:

We needed men to pick broccoli, and we were sent 60 men from the Department of Farm Labor; 2 men worked 2 hours, another 4 hours, the others refused to work at all.

Another letter comes from an association which hires Mexican nationals in my district. They said they went to the State of California Farm Placement Service and they attempted to replace our Mexican nationals with domestic workers. The result was that in 2 weeks' time they sent out 23 domestic unemployed to 1 of their growers. One of the 23 worked 4 days, the others worked

from 2 hours to less than a day. Yet that operation needed 40 men.

I point out that the legitimate farm laborer who sincerely desires work will always have that work in the particular section of California which I happen to represent. I can show you hundreds of men who devote their lives to rendering this type of service and who have a better standard of living than the average factory worker in the big city. But unfortunately not enough of these men exist, and we still lose our crops.

One more important point, and that is that the industrial workers who are in the packing sheds in the plants where these crops are packaged and processed will lose their jobs unless the field workers are available to harvest the crops of the raw material which these people put into packages.

I contend that if you deny us an adequate source of farm labor to harvest our highly perishable specialty crops you will be denying industrial workers in the packing sheds their right to earn a living.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt as to the probable outcome of this joint resolution, but I should like to place myself on record as stating that it is a poor resolution for this body to pass.

It seems rather strange to me, listening to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER], that he could not get qualified Americans at \$1.60 an hour. There must be a rather strange situation existing when they cannot get Americans at \$1.60 an hour.

My friend admittedly has an interest, and he had a perfect right as a Member of this body to express his thoughts, but he clearly showed he had an interest. He is speaking for one segment, the big producers. On the other hand, I have something here from a qualified person who is certainly disinterested, but whose concern is not only with the bodies of men, women, and children, the families of the workers, but also with the souls of the workers and their families. I read a telegram that I have here dated February 26, 1954, addressed to me. It is as follows:

Will you please express my earnest hope to your colleagues in the House of Representatives that as many of them as possible be present Monday to vote against House Joint Resolution 355. As I have written to President Eisenhower and Chairman CLIFFORD HOPE of the House Agricultural Committee, I feel strongly the proposed unilateral amendment to Public Law 78 will accentuate the wetback problem rather than cure it, will enlarge the injustice to Mexican workers crossing the border rather than lessening it, and will cause further injustice to our domestic workers: at the same time mistreatment of individual human beings would thus be increased. Enactment of this legislation at the behest of powerful interests in five States will gravely endanger our relations with Mexico and all Latin American Republics. Our good-neighbor policy is clearly at stake in this issue.

That telegram is signed by Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of the archdiocese of San Antonio in Texas.

The other day President Eisenhower made a statement and among other things he said that the United States

leadership, and I quote, "reflects no ambition for world power. It springs from no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations."

Yet, here we are, powerful America, the most powerful nation in the world passing a bill today that will be an affront to our neighbor to the south. Should we do it? Is it for our best interest to do it? We see the situation in Korea. We know it is fraught with danger. We see the situation in Indochina. We see the situation existing in the Near East and in the Middle East. We see the world confronted with danger. We see the dangerous situation existing internally in Italy and in France. Now by this legislation we are going out of our way to affront our neighbor to the south, and when you affront any Central or South American country, you affront all nations in South America. So far as I am concerned, I hope this bill will not pass. I am doubtful, however. I feel quite certain it will pass, but it should not pass. In any event, I hope the Government of Mexico, and the press of Mexico, and the people of Mexico will not hold its passage and its affront to them against all Americans. To me it is one of the strangest situations to see great America at this time with the Secretary of State in Venezuela at a meeting, at a conference of South American and North American nations calling for unity and amity, as I say, to me it is one of the strangest situations to see the House of Representatives of America considering and passing this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not any sound or logical argument has been presented on the floor of the House as to why this resolution should be adopted. An effort has been made to lead the Members of the House to believe that this is but a mere continuation of a program which has been in operation since 1948. It is a repudiation of that policy. It is a go-it-alone policy. There is no need for this foreign labor in this country at this time. I want to ask the gentleman if he will sum up the arguments in favor of this resolution. We are told the administration wants it, but we are not told why it wants it.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I can say to the gentleman is that the passage of this bill at this time is fraught with danger. The only construction that can be placed upon it by the people of Mexico is that we are putting a club over their head. We are trying to overcome that impression—a hangover from the past. The South American countries have a feeling that we have been acting the part of the big brother with a big club in our hand. It is going to take many generations to overcome that feeling. This bill is not conducive to better relationships with our neighbor to the south, but is conducive to increasing tensions, all to the disadvantage of both countries. I repeat, if this bill passes the House, I hope the officials of the Government of Mexico and the members of Mexico and the people of Mexico will realize that there

were some among us in this body who fought the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I live on the border of Mexico in west Texas and represent 500 miles of Mexican border. I have heard all of this discussion, and I cannot understand why the Members should work up so much heat over a very simple matter. But, in my opinion, and I have many things to base that on, it all stems from the heads of the CIO. They have been trying for the last several years to deny any Mexican labor coming into this country because, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] said yesterday, they are not dues-paying members. So they are against their entry.

That does not adversely affect the laboring men in this country in any way. This country needs these Mexican laborers. As has been pointed out by several speakers, we have no stoop laborers. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] says \$1.60 would appeal to a lot of men out of work. That may be true, but they are not skilled in that type of work. If it was not a skilled job, that \$1.60 an hour might appeal to them.

We have been getting more and more difficult situations into this agreement to try to keep on friendly relations with Mexico. There are no more interested people than those in Texas who are interested in that friendly policy. There is no man in this House who has more friends in Mexico than have I, or who have spent more time in Mexico than have I. I do not believe the Mexican officials are as much concerned about this, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has pointed out. As a matter of fact, I heard a few days ago the President of Mexico felt that he could straighten this thing out in a few minutes. But I went to Mexico 2 or 3 years ago, very much concerned about the way this thing was going on. We were getting increased hardships injected into this Mexican labor agreement, so that the farmers cannot employ Mexicans at all. We have almost reached that point now. I went down to Mexico and found that there was one of the head men of the CIO down there telling our Labor Department what to put into the agreement between the United States and Mexico. I saw him there every day for about 3 days. So it is not just guesswork with me. I know the CIO is trying to run this thing. The laboring people are not adversely affected, but they are benefited, because if we can grow crops and harvest them, if we can keep those crops from spoiling and get them into commercial channels, the members of labor get cheaper vegetables and products than if they are not allowed to be harvested.

I have heard a great deal about the cost of this program from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. He said a lot about \$2-million cost. It is true. I understand they have been spending a considerable sum in processing and examining nationals coming

through in the regular manner. At the same time, it is relieving the border-patrol men and the immigration agents from doing a lot of work that they would otherwise have to do. So the Government in the long run would probably be spending that same \$2 million in enforcement officers in other places, instead of in the Labor Department.

I do not think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] should be so concerned about \$2 million being spent in some 20 States in the Union when our Government is spending a considerable sum in the Carolinas in subsidizing tobacco. We have to have a little Government support on this, that is true. You might keep that in mind.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Since the gentleman is from the border country, as am I, the two of us know the Mexican people and admire them. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a sort of insult to the Mexican Government and the Mexican people to suggest that they would consider it an affront for the United States Congress to take it on ourselves to legislate on an issue that is domestic, in that it deals with foreign labor in this country legally, that are being processed and given very favorable working contracts.

Does not the gentleman think that Mexico is not the type of nation or the type of people who would resent our doing what we have a right to do under our sovereignty as a nation?

Mr. REGAN. The gentleman is correct. They are reasonable, sensible people; and I want to say again that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] and I both have many friends among the Mexican people. We are not going to offend them through this legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

WHY UNNECESSARILY OFFEND MEXICO?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in what may now be said it is my sincere hope that no Member of the House will construe what is about to be said as an attempt to solicit, I would not say "get", solicit the favor of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] by agreeing with one of the views he just expressed.

This bill is an apparently harmless one. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] said that Michigan had 2,500 Mexican workers. We have onions, carrots, cabbages, cauliflower, tomatoes, worlds of crops; we have square miles of muck land where you cannot get an American, much less an Irishman, to get down on his knees and pull weeds, thin plants; they just will not do it. And, of course, the members of the CIO, and there is a fine delegation down here from the CIO, and the UE from Whirlpool Corp. are in opposition to this bill. I can understand why when these people come in from Mexico and they cannot be forced into a union to pay initiation fees and dues, why the CIO does not want them here; that is not

hard to figure out. Neither can I understand why when the CIO or UE men do not want the work, will not do the job which the Mexicans want and will do, they should object, unless it be on the ground just suggested. Certainly the union men want cheaper vegetables, farm produce, for their families.

But there is something else about the bill, in view of our foreign policy, that is not logical. What does the legislation do? As one reads it, it appears to be harmless, does it not? Apparently; but what it says in amending this law is that if the Secretary of Labor cannot agree with the Mexican Government, then he, the Secretary, can go ahead and recruit workers from Mexico anyway, regardless of what Mexico thinks. That is being bigger and stronger than Mexico. We will just deal with her individual citizens as we please, regardless of what the Mexican Government says or does. In short Mexico, though friendly, can like it or lump it.

We have spent billions upon billions of dollars, we have had at least a million men in the armed services to buy friendship. One of the objectives for the spending of billions, getting into two wars was to retain the friendship of other nations by helping them fight communism and the Communists. We have been at it for 20 long years, trying, we were told, to build up friendship. Now we come along with this bill, and we say to Mexico: "You either agree or the Secretary of Labor will do five things." And whether you like it makes no difference. "This is it; you take it and like it." Is that the way to treat a friendly nation? Would we do that to Britain? What are the things we authorize the Secretary to do? I sent over to get the statute law. It lists five things that the Secretary of Labor can do without paying any attention to what the Mexican Government wants. Here is the statutory authorization:

The Secretary is given authority:

(1) To recruit such workers (including any such workers who have resided in the United States for the preceding 5 years, or who are temporarily in the United States under legal entry);

(2) To establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States;

(3) To provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the continental United States to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to such recruitment centers after termination of employment;

(4) To provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding \$150 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers.

Somebody said that the Mexican Government wanted a minimum wage. Well, we have it in this country. Is there any reason why they should not have a minimum wage? And their people who come up here, should they not receive a minimum wage? Then the same gentle-

man, my very dear friend from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] said they had less than a hundred in Iowa—said that the Mexicans were trying to channel the insurance—I suppose health and welfare—into some particular company. Well, bless your dear heart, that is what the labor racketeers do in this country. When I wanted to stop it a committee of the House said: "Get out of that one; we do not want you monkeying around there."

Permit me to repeat: Just what can the Secretary do? He is authorized to recruit such workers.

That is all there in section 1. To recruit such workers. That is solicit Mexicans to leave their homes, their country and do the work we will not do.

What else does he do? "Establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing."

That is to say, he can go across the Mexican border, send his agents across to coax workers into signing employment contracts, put up a barracks, housing facilities, he can pay the transportation of the Mexicans from their homes to wherever this center is, he can feed those Mexicans and take care of them, give them medical services while they are there, yes, he can bury them, too, if it does not cost more than \$150. All of that the Secretary of Labor can do without the consent of the Mexican authorities. He can tell the representatives of this friendly nation to "go peddle their papers." We will deal with their people as we wish.

I do not know what is coming over the folks here who talk about States rights. Why, do you not in this resolution want to retain the bargaining power in the Congress? You want to give the Secretary of Labor the authority and let him go down and establish these recruiting centers to coax the Mexicans to come over here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the only point I care to make is we need these workers in Michigan. We need between 3,000 and 3,500 of them this coming year. We need them in the canning and processing factories as well as on the farms. We want them in Michigan.

But certainly our folks do not want the Secretary of Agriculture in opposition to the policies which we have supported and which has cost us so much in dollars, in lives, and suffering in trying to get the good will of the other nations to act arbitrarily and without the approval of the Government of this friendly nation in inducing its people to come here just because they will work for less than others. We do not want the Secretary of Agriculture to go down there close to the line or perhaps in Mexico and do things

to which the Mexican government objects. Do we want the Secretary to coax these people away from their homeland by giving them more money, more money than they can make at home, to come across the border and defy the Mexican Government to prescribe rules, regulations, or laws under which their own people may operate? We can do all that need be done easily enough by negotiation. Are we being Christians—friendly when instead of appointing members of a joint Commission to do the job we give the Secretary power to tell Mexico you do this or we, because we have the power, will do it anyway. We do not need to use strong-arm methods, we do not need to tell them we are going to do it anyway, we do not need to say we are going to get your men and women to come over here whether you want us to or not, and you have nothing to say or do about their wages or living conditions.

Think it over. I do not want to oppose the Farm Bureau. I try to go along with their program, but I do not believe in delegating authority to an executive to deal with a friendly nation when that nation does not want to deal with him. Maybe I will have to vote "present." If I do, it will be the second time I have done that since I have been here. I am not laboring under any delusions about what is going to happen here. The bill will be passed by a comfortable margin. If it does, and I vote "no," then once more I am not going along with my leadership and the Eisenhower administration. I would like to go along sometime on something with them. I wish they would send up more of the sound, sensible ideas which, even though they are old, made us what we are.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear in the beginning that I am not speaking for California, Arizona or for a lot of these other places. I am speaking for the eighth congressional district of Louisiana. And I am not talking about what somebody told me or about something that I read in a book. I am going to talk to you about what I, GEORGE LONG, know about this situation.

We come here and we talk about overproduction. We have too much butter, we have too much wheat, we have too much corn, we have too much of everything; yet you want to bring more people into this country to create more surplus for the Government to buy. That is the whole story. You want to bring

in more labor, Mexican labor, and I do not care where they come from.

In my part of the country we have reduced the need for cotton pickers by half, by the use of the cotton picking machines. I raise cotton. I am a cotton farmer. I know something about these Mexican laborers, and I am going to tell you about them, too. We further reduced the need for cotton pickers by reducing the number of acres by 33 1/3 percent.

Now we have on our hands, along with much of the rest of the United States, unemployment. The people I am talking about do not raise crops. They do not own a foot of land. The only place they have is the home that they live in. They work on the farms by the hour or by the day. They are recruited by people who come to town and take them off to the farm and work them for that day. These people, many of them, are today out of work because much cotton land is not being cultivated. They will not be needed to pick the cotton.

This Mexican laborer business has been bothering my part of the country a long time. We can recruit all the labor we need, and we can help Texas if they want it, right out of Louisiana where these people live.

Let us see what there is about these Mexican laborers. They are brought into our State in cattle trucks, standing up; there is not even room to sit down. They cannot speak a word of English, but they have a man with them who can. And he sells them, he trades them to these big farmers.

You talk about the CIO wanting this bill or the American Federation of Labor wanting this bill. I will tell you who wants this bill. The big cotton farmer in Louisiana wants these Mexican laborers, because he can hire them for a pittance as against the laborers who live there. And he is doing it. There is no question about his doing it. Do not be deceived about who is doing this. Some of the Members have been a little caustic here. Do you know what this is? This is for the big farmers in California, in Louisiana, and in the rest of this country. They are the people who want the bill. This is the payoff to the big farmers and the big cattle raisers for having financed the Republican campaign. I am speaking for the poor fellow who does not have a dime and who cannot speak for himself and who wants an opportunity to go out and earn a living for a bunch of little old kids. In many of those huts there are living 2 and 3 families who are begging for a chance to earn an honest living. Do not deny them that chance.

If Texas wants this, if California wants it, let them have it. But do not force it on the State of Louisiana where we have men on relief rolls today begging for work.

Announcement by President Eisenhower that this country will resume negotiations with Mexico toward an agreement on importation of farm labor from that country falls far short of the action required to solve the wetback problem. In 1951, before he entered the White House, Mr. Eisenhower called the wetback situation a moral disgrace.

Since he became President, traffic in this contraband labor has increased to a current rate of 1 million a year. At the same time a dangerous relaxation in the standards formerly protecting such workers has taken place.

Pressure for increased immigration of Mexican farmworkers comes from the big ranchers and corporate farms of California and the Southwest. These interests gave the Republican ticket heavy political and financial support in their campaign. In response to their claims that an emergency exists, the Department of Labor is now, with doubtful legality, recruiting farmworkers for them at the border.

There is no justification for legislation, already approved by the Agriculture Committees of both Houses of Congress, authorizing the Department of Labor to contract for seasonal farmworkers from Mexico. Unemployment in the United States is increasing rapidly, with more than 3 1/2 million now idle. The situation in Louisiana at this time is deplorable. There are thousands of unemployed men—farmers and laborers—forced off the farms as a result of the reduction in cotton acreage. The landlords are not in position to keep them because cotton is the money crop, and they do not have enough land. Many farms which supported from 75 to 100 families now have 25 or less.

For the past several years, the laborers on cotton farms have found it increasingly difficult to obtain employment. Now that the cotton acreage has been reduced, many thousands of people who have no other vocation are out of work. In the main, these people are well trained in farming but untrained in any other line.

Alien Mexican labor is a problem for other reasons. Use and sale of narcotics increase as do crimes of violence. Illegitimate births, attributable to alien fathers, are common.

I suggest that we make the wetbacks drybacks and leave them in Mexico where they cannot compete with our farm laborers. All the farm labor needed this year can be recruited in Louisiana and other Southern States, I am sure; and I trust we will not be foolish enough to think that we are doing anyone a favor when we bring more labor into this country, thereby forcing the minimum wage down instead of up and reducing our standard of living to the point that we will again have in this country unfed and unclothed men and women—all brought on by the fact that we were not wise enough to see in time and avoid the indiscriminate admission of Mexican labor into this country. We already have laws by which Mexican labor can be brought into this country; and there is no need, year after year, to meet here and fight out this problem of making legal that which is otherwise illegal.

It seems to me that we ought to wake up and, instead of crying high taxes, put into practice measures calculated to remove the burden from the taxpayers. I earnestly hope that the Members of this Congress will take stock, do some figuring for themselves, and not be stampeded by a group of big farmers who employ large numbers of laborers each year and want

to hire them just as cheaply as they can. They seem to be not at all concerned with the misery that will result, such as sickness from overcrowding and even death to children who are undernourished. We all know the weak go first; and when adults cannot find employment to support their families, then malnutrition follows. This is a serious situation and, rather than patch together the old pact for importing workers, Congress should look to the rights of American citizens who have been treated with a good deal less consideration than their foreign cousins. If we continue to admit Mexicans, we will certainly live to see the day that we will regret it. The Congress of the United States can and should be held responsible for the condition that is bound to come if this bill is passed.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about this legislation. Let us at the start clear up one thing. Statements were made by several of the speakers supporting the legislation which might lead people to believe that this is the same legislation, that it has the same thought behind it, that has been on this floor in previous years. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Let us review for just a brief moment the history of this legislation. Before I review it briefly, may I say that in that review I hope to justify the position taken by the labor movements of this country, about which some critical or unfounded remarks were made today.

During the years of World War II there was found to be a great shortage of labor qualified and willing and available for agricultural work. Nobody denied it. It was well recognized. The labor movements of the United States cooperated in setting up a program that would open the borders of this country to Mexican labor that was available because their citizens were not being used in as great numbers as ours were on the battlefield.

At the cessation of the war that program was terminated or reduced. In 1948 it was proposed that a new program be worked out which would supply labor to a recognized shortage in the farm and agricultural areas of this country. The labor movement recognized the need. The labor movement came back to Washington and sat down in conferences. At that time as the President of the California State Federation of Labor I took part in those conferences and urged the working out of a program which would bring Mexican labor into the United States under properly negotiated contracts to help solve the labor shortage in the agricultural field.

That program as enacted into law by the Congress provided for a contract or a treaty between this country and the Mexican Government. A contract takes two parties, it takes a meeting of the minds, and it must be bilateral. There may be some unilateral points of execution, but the contract must be bilateral between two separate and distinct people. That is what we had, and it expired on January 15 of this year.

Since then what has happened? This country went on its own, carrying out its

own policy to bring these people in. The Comptroller General of the United States advised the Secretary of Labor and the administrative agencies that they were expending the funds appropriated by this Congress to be used for the purpose of carrying out such agreement as was arrived at between our two countries, the United States and Mexico, under the previous law passed, they were expending the funds illegally and unlawfully, and they must cease and desist.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman point out at that place in his remarks the fact that the law under which these agreements have been executed is still on the books and still in operation? It was continued at the request of the present administration, and goes through 1955. It was only the contracts that have expired, and they have been extended for 6 weeks pending the outcome of these negotiations.

Mr. SHELLEY. What the gentleman has said is absolutely correct. The law is still on the books. The contract agreement has expired, and the contract agreement in the past several days has been extended for 6 weeks pending the outcome of the resumed negotiations that are now going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how many there are who desire to speak on the joint resolution at this time. I think we ought to close up the general debate.

Mr. COOLEY. I think there are about 4 or 5 on this side, maybe 6.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 16 gentlemen standing.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to object to additional time and I shall not object as far as the gentleman from California is concerned, but I think I shall be compelled to object to additional time on the part of any other Member, in view of the fact that there are still a large number who desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, when the contract expired on January 15, large numbers of workers rushed to the Mexican border, at least in my State, and I assume there were similar occurrences in and along the border in other States. You saw the pictures of such occurrences as shown by Mr. COOLEY earlier in this debate. I have on the committee desk on this side of the aisle notarized affidavits from people who witnessed the situation where the employees of the Department of Immigration of the United States, Department of Employment, and of the border patrol who had rounded up not only Mexicans who had originally come in legally, but those who had come in illegally, brought them to the border

and told them, "There is no longer any contract. We will take you to the border. You put your foot over and then jump back and you will then be a legal entrant under the way we are now operating." I have any number of affidavits from people who saw that operation. That is not denied. That is what will prevail if you adopt this kind of legislation. What will we do with these people after they are here if the Mexican Government at some subsequent date refuses to take them back? You are passing legislation which is creating a terrific social impact upon the conditions of American workers. In this resolution you are passing legislation which can have the most dire effect on our diplomatic situation in Central and South America where the Communist agents have been operating for some time in Guatemala and in Mexico, and who several years ago were in strong power in Chile, who have been using the argument that the United States is an imperialistic country which will simply operate for its own benefit, to exploit the citizens of neighboring states. At this particular time with the Inter-American Conference going on in Caracas, Venezuela, we certainly should not approach this matter hastily. We have spent some years developing and carrying out a good neighbor policy in our relationships with our southern neighbors. Are we going to let the avaricious desire of some few factory farmers destroy that relationship? That is exactly what we will be doing in passing this legislation.

Further, there is no provision for proper screening as to the health hazards or as to the criminal background or narcotic addiction or peddling, and the Justice Department and the Health Department many times made comment on that situation. In some of the communities in my State, the local authorities are now complaining of the number of Mexicans, both legally admitted and illegally admitted who have come in and have become problems, social problems, and health problems for those communities.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot have an understanding as to the termination of debate on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the joint resolution and amendments thereto close at 4:30 p. m.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. I think only 3 or 4 Members have spoken since general debate on the joint resolution was concluded. Only 3 or 4 Members have spoken under the 5-minute rule. You can see from the number of Members standing the great interest in this legislation. It seems to me it would be very unwise to shorten the debate in any such fashion. I shall be forced to object to any such request because when we were engaged in general debate, I know that many Members wanted time and we only had an hour on this side. Unfortunately, I consumed more time than I had anticipated. I am sure the Members are sincere in wanting to present their views on this matter. I hope the gentleman will not press for a limitation

of time at this moment, but let us go on for a little while.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, there has been a considerable amount of debate under the 5-minute rule. We had ample debate during the 2 hours that was allowed for the discussion of this measure. I believe the Committee is ready to vote in the near future.

I move that all debate on the bill, and amendments thereto, close at 4:30.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—ayes 103, noes 31.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], is recognized.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to point out two things that I believe are apparent from the debate that has taken place today. One is that whereas these negotiations had been stalemated for some time before this legislation was considered by the committee and before a rule was granted, since that time we are making some progress. If we pass this legislation we will make some more progress. There has been nothing come up that I know of that has indicated that what we have done in any way has offended the Mexican Government or the Mexican people.

Second, with the exception of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], every Member who has opposed this legislation also opposed the initial legislation to permit bringing Mexican labor into this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 355. I do so somewhat reluctantly because I have farmer friends in my district who feel that this legislation is necessary to a proper solution of their labor problems. I do not question their sincerity. I do question their estimate of the availability of domestic farm labor in this country. In the light of undisputed reports of growing unemployment in all categories of labor including farm labor I would be abdicating fair judgment if I found any necessity for enactment of this bill; moreover I would be deserting all reasonable concepts of humanitarianism and legislative objectivity if I failed to oppose it. I apologize to my friends for our difference of opinion.

I would preface further remarks on the substance of the situation by qualifying myself as somewhat of an expert on the subject of agricultural labor. I represent a great three-county agricultural area. Therein we grow almost every variety of crop which contributes to our national food and fiber requirements and some of these crops are almost exclusively grown in my district. I am familiar with the recent history of labor supply and demand with respect to the production and harvesting of these groups. Truck, tree fruit, and vine crops require a lot of hand labor. The production and harvesting of cotton re-

quires a great deal of hand labor. In the early thirties depression and drought in the great Southwest displaced a great many of the good people in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and New Mexico. These people came to California seeking jobs and until the outset of World War II constituted almost the sole source of the labor necessary for such crops. In the course of time many of these fine people settled on the land and have become successful entrepreneurs in our economy but there are many of them who have never ceased doing farm labor and they have continued to supply a good portion of our farm-labor requirement. This requirement has declined by reason of mechanization and this fact plus the fact that emigres to our cities are available for peak agricultural employment has resulted in the establishment of a most stable relationship between employment demand and supply met largely out of the labor pool created by the influx of people I have mentioned. These are the people who lose jobs to imported laborers in time of job shortages.

The timing of this legislation is extremely bad. It can be justified only on the basis of labor shortage. In my opinion this shortage does not presently exist in my area of California; moreover, I question the validity of a conclusion of shortage in any other area because like growers in other areas some of my growers insist they have a labor shortage in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary. I voted for 1953 legislation continuing the treaty arrangement. In my opinion that is the only proper method to handle a real labor shortage.

We have heard a great deal of talk about wetbacks, so-called by reason of illegal entrance into this country. This bill is speciously described as a solution to the wetback problem. I certainly reject this argument. I would hate to conclude that a great country like the United States could only close its borders to illegal entrants by the device of offering jobs to foreigners, jobs which are needed by our own people. Those who hold such an opinion have small faith in our institutions. If there is any truth in this conclusion we are, indeed in trouble because the Justice Department recently reported that over 100 past and present Communists cross the border daily in this horde of legal and illegal Mexican laborers.

In truth the only real justification for this bill is a purported shortage of domestic agricultural labor. Let us examine this justification.

I have before me a story from the Fresno Bee of February 17, 1954. The head reads "Work Program Is Ordered for Farm Jobless." The article states that the welfare director for Kings County, my home county, stated:

We have the greatest agricultural relief load since the depression. In the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys many agricultural workers will be reemployed by spring but the outlook is not so good.

Further:

Rible was of the opinion work production will reduce the crime rate and if there is a bona fide need a family man will be glad to work.

A February 16 story in the Bakersfield Californian is headed "Fresno To Ask: More Agents To Rout Wetbacks," Sidney Cruft, the chairman of the Fresno County board of supervisors, is quoted as saying:

There is no doubt that every wetback at work in the county is keeping a citizen out of a job.

A story in the Fresno Bee of February 17 reports that the county has formally appealed to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for a more vigorous program of deporting Mexican aliens to relieve the agricultural unemployment situation in that county. A letter addressed by the county board of supervisors to that Federal agency reads in part:

The demand upon our county welfare department for general relief to employable but unemployed citizen agricultural workers is rising out of proportion to normal expectations. At the same time a rapid increase in thefts, burglaries, and robberies may be traced to these destitute and needy people.

The Fresno Bee, one of the outstanding newspapers in the United States has twice editorialized on the necessity of reducing the number of alien Mexican laborers in order that American citizens might have jobs.

Gentlemen this is the situation in my part of the country with respect to the presence or absence of local farm-labor supply, and I venture to say that there are as many big operators shedding crocodile tears about the absence of local labor here as exist in any part of the 5 States which principally seek this legislation.

If local people are unemployed by lack of jobs it makes no difference whether available jobs are being filled by aliens legally in the United States or illegally in the United States. In either event the local citizen is just as unemployed, just as broke, just as hungry, just as susceptible to an economic urge to rob or steal.

Only the most urgent and demonstrable necessity would dictate the importation of a foreign-labor force consisting almost solely of male persons unaccompanied by families. Aside from the question of displacement of local labor such a labor force carries with it social problems of overwhelming importance.

Until the advent of a large foreign Mexican labor force in California the rural areas of California had no problem of narcotic use and sale. Today each edition of the local papers carries news of arrests for narcotic addiction or sale. In an overwhelming number of cases the person arrested has a name of Mexican ethnic origin. He is either an alien or a domestic corrupted by association with aliens. I understand that Mexico is now the prime source of heroin used in this country and it would be unrealistic to assume that day laborers crossing the border would not be used as agents or carriers. Crimes of violence are various and frequent in those areas which have a large foreign-labor population.

Prostitution and illegitimacy are other common occurrences. These conditions are typical of communities with a displaced male labor force without women

or any real roots in the community. It is to the credit of the Catholic Church that it has always recognized this problem through the vehicle of the Rural Life Conference, so ably headed in California by Monsignor O'Dwyer.

Gentlemen, in expressing the foregoing conclusions I make no inference of basic inferiority with respect to any ethnic group. I am merely expressing a prejudice in favor of American citizens over alien residents in this country under the peculiar conditions of agricultural employment. We have, in the San Joaquin Valley, a local population of Mexican origin of recent or distant character. These persons are citizens. They participate in community affairs. They have families. They are among our best citizens and contribute a large number of persons to our farm-labor supply. They need your protection.

I urge you to defeat this disgraceful legislation which is unjustified and is a direct affront to a friendly government.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] is recognized.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER and Mr. PHILLIPS yielded their time to Mr. WILSON of California.)

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am perhaps as near being a wetback as any Member here, for I was born on the Mexican border and have lived my life on the Mexican border. I know the problem very well.

This legislation is a sincere attempt to eliminate the wetback menace. I think the bill should be known as the wetback control bill. It is the result of a visit to the border by the Attorney General last summer. He was very much concerned about the number of arrests of wetbacks in our State last year. He came down to the border to see what the problem was. As a result he saw that some changes were needed in existing agreements, and he and the Department of Labor have been attempting to get those changes put into the agreement with Mexico. Mexico has not yet agreed to go along with us, and so they have not signed the new agreement, but I am confident that if we pass this legislation and if Mexico sees that we are sincere in wanting to make some minor changes in the agreement we can eliminate the very serious wetback menace that confronts us. I hope you will support this legislation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill now before us. It serves two major purposes. First, it helps to provide for the orderly recruitment of supplemental agricultural labor from Mexico. Second, it makes possible more effective administration of the immigration laws. In other words, it will help solve the wetback problem.

In order to gain a clear and accurate picture of the present farm labor situation in California and the need for supplemental workers from Mexico in the immediate future, I asked for a report from the Department of Employment of the State of California. I received such a report dated February 18, 1954, signed

by Edward F. Hayes, chief of the farm placement service of said department, and I quote from his report:

Southern California is in the early stages of harvesting nearly 100,000 acres of lemons and navel oranges. Current employment in these 2 citrus crops totals 8,700 workers, and the rising labor demand is expected to reach 12,000 by mid-March, if weather and crop maturity follow present indications. The 8,700 workers currently picking citrus include about 6,000 contract Mexican nationals. These harvests will be at a peak some time between late March and the first of May, when the peak labor requirement may total 13,000 workers.

At the present time there are 16,750 Mexican nationals under contract to California employers, with 14,000 of these men, here under original contracts, subject to return to Mexico, under present regulations, on or before February 26, 1954. It will be impossible to replace these workers with domestic farm workers. Our offices have been conducting urgent recruitment among unemployed domestic workers, trying to replace these Mexicans but without success.

Furthermore, California faces the spring peak of planting and thinning operations, and early vegetable harvests calling for additional workers in most parts of the State. In addition to continuing or rising labor needs in Imperial Valley vegetables and southern California citrus crops, the next major need requiring large numbers of supplemental workers will be possibly 2,000 for the harvest of some 65,000 acres of asparagus in the San Joaquin-Sacramento delta area, starting about March 1 and normally requiring a peak total of about 9,000 workers between April and June.

To give you some idea of the significance of the labor needs cited, in relation to the State total farm-labor picture, total employment on farms at mid-February was about 398,000, with current shortages of 1,100. Approximately 97,000 of the total were engaged in major seasonal operations, including about 50,000 in the harvests, and pruning of orchards and vineyards; more than 30,000 in vegetables, and about 17,000 in field crops—principally cotton picking.

Although California has an estimated 200,000 unemployed workers at the present time, these are primarily nonagricultural workers, including seasonal employees of canneries, other processing plants, lumbering, and construction industries, as well as workers unemployed by industrial layoffs. Agricultural employment is being offered to these people but with very few acceptances, and the turnover of those who have accepted available farm jobs has been very high.

We hope this information conveys the urgency of California's need for immediate decision and action to maintain and augment our supply of supplemental Mexican workers.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, if I have any additional time I would just like to say there are over a thousand farmers in my district who are interested in this legislation. We hear about the big contract farmers which are supposed to be the only ones supporting this legislation. Most of my farmers run small citrus groves and small truck farms; they are not the large contract farmers, yet they do use a few of these contract laborers and they are very much interested in this legislation. So it is not a bill that benefits the big farmers, it benefits a great many of the small farmers who are producing our truck crops. I urge adoption of this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Mr. RHODES of Arizona was given to Mr. HOSMER.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, some difficulties have been pointed out here by certain of the objectors to this bill that it might cause some slight to the Mexican Government and cause some difficulty with our international relations in that regard. It has also been pointed out by some of the opponents of the bill the fear that it might permit the illegal importation of narcotics into this country from the Republic of Mexico. I truly believe these fears are not justified. However, if they do exist, and these opponents are sincere, and if it may likewise be sincere among the people of Mexico and the Government of Mexico, there is a measure now pending before the Judiciary Committee of this House to establish a joint United States-Mexico Commission to handle the problem of wetbacks and narcotics that can be passed by this House as a supplement to the measure now before us, which would set at rest any of those fears that have been expressed on those two counts.

I sincerely hope that such measure will be passed by the House before this session is ended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Mr. THOMPSON of Texas was given to Mr. MAHON.)

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from Texas, my friend, CLARK THOMPSON, for yielding me the brief time allotted to him. His support of this legislation is well known, and his interest in the cause of agriculture and labor is, likewise, well known. Mr. Chairman, one of the Members has previously referred to his personal acquaintance with this subject. I, too, can talk about the agricultural labor situation from firsthand knowledge. I think I represent the heaviest cotton-producing district in the United States. Much of that cotton is harvested by Mexican nationals.

The Mexican national law has done a great deal to raise the standards of the agricultural worker in the Southwest. It has brought about better housing facilities, better sleeping and living conditions, better utilities for the workers; it has raised the standards of the agricultural worker and it has done a great deal for the cause of labor. I yield to no one in my support of the working people of this country—organized or unorganized. I would not be willing to support a measure that would discriminate against the rights and privileges of our own American laborers. I would not be willing to see foreign labor imported as a device for lowering the employment opportunities, the living conditions, or the wages of American working people. I well realize that this program must be administered with great care in order that we fully safeguard the rights of our own people.

Someone said on the floor that these people work for a mere pittance. The truth is that the Mexican national worker by reason of the contract is paid the prevailing wage. The truth is that during the peak of the cotton-harvesting season in my congressional district, the Mexican

national who comes there makes more money per hour, per day, and per week than many of the school teachers in my district, than many of the clerks in the stores for a comparable period. They make from \$5 to \$10 and more, probably \$15 or \$20 per day in the peak of the season helping harvest the cotton crop.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Mr. MADDEN was given to Mr. McCARTHY.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, ever since I have been a Member of the Congress this farm labor bill has been presented to the Congress as the solution to the wetback problem. The statistics in regard to the number of wetbacks who have been caught and returned show clearly that every time we pass a new bill the wetback problem becomes worse instead of better. Before we had any legal program from ten to twelve thousand illegals were coming into the country each year. Since the passage of the first so-called legalizing act of 1943 the number of illegal entries has increased, until last year the number apprehended was approximately 875,000.

If we are going to pass this bill, let us not act upon it as a means of controlling the wetback problem, because it simply will not accomplish that purpose. What the Committee on Agriculture should do, instead of weakening the present act, is to give some study to the recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor as reported in 1951.

I should like to ask the members of the committee whether they have given any consideration to those recommendations; whether they have tried to do anything about the migratory farm labor problem in the United States; whether they have proposed anything that would improve the wages or the working conditions or the standard of living of these people.

As a matter of fact, the only improvement that has come has been the result of the insistence of the Mexican Government that we in the United States set up certain standards with regard to wages and working conditions for Mexican nationals who come into this country. The only standard we have is one that is related to what the Mexican Government has insisted that we set up for her nationals, and the committee now is asking us to weaken those standards. I think this legislation should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN].

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, twice, on yesterday and today, I have heard remarks about irresponsible statements of somebody from one of the bureaus here, made in an effort to get a higher appropriation, and saying that there were hundreds of Communists coming across at El Paso under the guise of being braceros. That is not true. I defy them to prove it. I know it is not true.

Further I resent the fact that these hardworking Mexicans, who come over here to try to make a few honest dollars, are accused of being Communists, because they are not that type of people. They are pretty good, decent, fair, hard-

working Mexicans who are doing work over here that our overrich people will not do.

One more thing. This bill, in my opinion, is to determine whether or not the Congress of the United States or the CIO is calling the turn on what we shall do in the United States. I hope this will be supported in a substantial way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in one minute one cannot cover very much ground on this subject. But the study on migratory labor of the United States Government is available to all the Members of the House. If they will study that one book, they will see what this is all about. I quote from page 79:

The United States Department of Agriculture figures on wages for farm labor in Texas in 1950 were 54 cents an hour; in New Mexico 54 cents an hour; in Arizona 64 cents an hour; and in California 88 cents an hour.

I might say that in the Imperial Valley in California farm-labor wages were about half what they were at the time up in the San Joaquin Valley, which is about 200 miles north. The farther away you get from the Mexican-California border the higher the farm wage gets. This proves the depressing effect of wetback or contract labor from Mexico.

This bill will give a cloak of "legalism" to labor exploitation by the corporate farm owners of the West.

It will have a bad effect on our international relations with Mexico and other Latin American countries.

I regret that time has been denied the opponents to effectively use the many arguments available against this bill. I shall vote against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

(By unanimous consent Mr. FISHER yielded the time allotted to him to Mr. GATHINGS.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, there has been quite a lot of discussion in this debate about the need for these Mexicans in the United States. I want to read a few sentences from a letter addressed to me from the Ventura County Citrus Growers Committee under date of February 24, 1954:

Our association made a request for 500 British West Indian workers, and we were told by the California Department of Employment that we would first have to take all the domestic referrals that they could send us. The appeal went forth during the third week of January by press, radio, and the department of employment job bulletin boards. Referrals were accepted from California, Arizona, and Nevada. On February 22 something over 2,600 referrals had been made to Ventura County. Over 1,100 of them actually reported to the packinghouses inquiring about the jobs; 565 to 575 agreed to accept employment; 305 actually reported on the job; and as of February 22 105 were working.

These people were both families and single men. We had houses for them to rent—2 to 4 bedrooms for \$10 and \$15 per month. We paid the deposits for electricity and gas, and 65 percent of the families used our houses, drew food in advance, and as soon as work was available left without paying for

food, deposits, or rent. We have a barrack type camp for single men; and, at last accounting on night of February 20, over four hundred men had gone through camp with 67 left and \$3,818 board and room bills left unpaid.

I might say that lemon picking is on a piece-rate basis and the average earnings for all pickers in our county last year was 97.4 cents for lemons and \$1.02 per hour for oranges. The average moneys earned applies to imported Mexican nationals, displaced persons, and American domestic workers, since all types and all classes of workers are paid on exactly the same rate and in many crews the workers are commingled. I would like to say also that our domestic crews are better than the other groups and earn a higher average.

Hoping that this information answers your request, I remain

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE H. MILLS,

President.

WILLIAM H. TOLBERT,

Manager.

That is out of 2,600 that had been referred.

I have a telegram here from the San Antonio Employment Association under date of February 23, 1954:

In re inquiry, quote figures of referrals by California Department of Employment, January 15 to present: 350 referred, 294 showed up, 275 had work in agriculture, 250 began work, 30 now working, average length of stay 2 days, records on 34 men show 15 left owing, total 69.

Here is another telegram, from the Southern California Farmers Association to me:

Following figures referrals California Department Employment to this labor association for citrus harvest January 15 to February 1: Referrals, 204; still working 5.

There is a distinct need for recruiting these workers from Mexico if farming operations are to be maintained and food and fiber crops cultivated and harvested. For the lack of workers when they are needed will mean higher prices for the consumer. Perishable commodities will deteriorate or spoil completely if they are not harvested when they are ready for harvest.

This resolution will provide a unilateral procedure to recruit needed Mexican workers when an agreement between the two Governments cannot be agreed upon. Unilateral action is not new to the Mexican officials. The hearings reveal that the Mexican representatives have blacklisted communities and counties on flimsy and unwarranted charges. The farmers residing in those communities or counties were denied workers until such time as a hearing was held and the facts revealed. I quote below a letter of an eminent Arkansas attorney received by me last week regarding the ridiculous charges used by Mexican officials to blacklist a whole county:

HALE & FOGLEMAN,

Marion, Ark., February 18, 1954.

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,

Member of Congress,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOOK: I am a day late getting you the information requested in your telephone call of yesterday, but had no secretary when court adjourned and was unable to locate my files.

The people in this territory found in dealing with the Mexican Government, with

reference to seasonal use of Mexican nationals, that many false claims were made and a great many unnecessary complaints were registered. In a hearing before the Mexican consul and the representatives of the United States Department of Labor last September, it was revealed that false claims were registered with reference to housing, subsistence, pay scale and the contracts in general.

To fully set this out, the representatives of Mexico made claims that housing was inadequate, although proper inspection and approval had been had; that bedding was improper, although it met the contract's specifications; that dishes were not clean, although it was the duty of the workmen to do their own dishwashing, etc.; complaint was made because certain Mexican nationals had been placed under arrest when, in fact, they had departed from the place of employment and were later expelled from the country.

Complaints were raised about filth in the quarters when the filthy conditions themselves were shown to have been a result of bad housekeeping by those using the premises.

We likewise were faced with complaints that the farmers did not pay the established prices, although the price was established at a time later than the period for which claim was made. This was a direct result of the investigation and price determination made in August of 1952 which was retroactive until June. Adjustments were promptly made, but great complaint was registered by the representatives of the Mexican Government.

Claims were likewise made by the consulate that local laborers were being paid more than their nationals. It developed that they were unable to prove a single instance of such improper action.

Of course, we do not insist that there were not errors or instances when some minor complaints might not have been proper. However, this was principally due to language difficulty and a difference in opinion as to the interpretation of the contract. It was found that a great majority of the claims were without foundation and that much trouble was caused by unnecessary meddling by the Mexican officials then in charge of the local office. We trust that this will be of some assistance to you.

Very truly yours,

JAMES C. HALE.

This legislation is needed. It is needed now. If approved it would uphold the hand of our Government officials in their negotiations. It would uphold the hand of the American farmer who asks a better work agreement, an agreement that will prevent the black-listing of an entire county without fully complying with the international agreement which requires joint action of the two governments and not the action of one government alone.

Our officials are asking that the worker himself should have some responsibilities to perform and that the farmer could withhold wages to reimburse him in case the worker jumped his contract and absconded. I trust the resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the Congress is seldom called upon to consider a more complicated social and economic problem than that presented in the pending resolution. I shall support it because I believe the existing supply of farm labor will prove insufficient in certain seasons and at the same time it will provide opportunities for residents of Mexico who are eager for this employment.

While I appreciate the desire of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] to avoid tension in our relations with the Republic of Mexico I am confident that the passage of the resolution will not have the effect of disturbing the relationship. Progress in working out a mutually satisfactory agreement must be made.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct attention to related problems which I trust will soon receive our attention. I refer to the absence of a coordinated Federal program for the welfare of all migrants, our native workers as well as those who come for a period from outside our borders. There is an appalling need for improved health, educational and welfare facilities for this group, particularly the children.

Now I realize that primarily the responsibility for this service belongs to local agencies and that private rather than governmental programs are required. I do not contend for Federal usurpation of these functions, but only that we cannot afford to enter the field of labor recruitment to the extent of this resolution without accepting the accompanying responsibility for providing, through all appropriate agencies, for the well-being of those affected by it.

This is an appealing human problem and it will continue to cry out for solution until we act.

I do not condemn the employers. They are harassed by cost problems, and they are busy with a multitude of seasonal tasks. Still our best hope is in the imagination and stimulated interest which they may display in this matter. Once aroused to its urgency they will exert leadership.

The soundness of a federally coordinated program in behalf of these uprooted multitudes cannot be questioned. I respectfully urge the great Committee on Agriculture to take time out to survey the needs.

There is abundant material on the subject. The President's Commission on Migratory Labor which completed its exhaustive studies on March 26, 1926, submitted comprehensive reports on various phases of the problem and outlined effective remedies. Still little has been done by Federal authority. For example, there is virtually a complete vacuum in Federal housing legislation for the migrant and seasonal workers.

State school facilities are often strained to provide minimum services and these efforts are poorly coordinated.

In the case of health, the fact that migrants by the nature of their occupation cannot meet residence requirements, imposed by law or regulation, combines with their poverty to deny them care. In addition, as pointed out by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, local governments are financially unable to pay the major share of health costs for this group. This factor, combined with the interstate nature of the problems involved, make it necessary, according to the Commission, for the Federal Government to share responsibility with the States in developing a health program for migrants.

In view of the growing trend toward mechanization of agriculture and the increased risks to farm workers, the Commission also recommended that the Departments of Labor and Agriculture, in cooperation with State agencies, institute a safety program and that the Department of Labor take the initiative in assisting administrators of State labor laws to solve problems of applying workmen's compensation to migratory farm workers. At the present time, only one State, Ohio, makes coverage of agricultural workers in their workmen's compensation laws compulsory. The Legislative Reference Service advises me that five other States—Arizona, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, and Wyoming—make coverage compulsory for certain mechanical or power operations on farms.

There are two Federal laws regulating child labor in agriculture: The Sugar Beet Act of 1937 and the Fair Labor Standards Act. However, according to the investigation of the Commission on Migratory Labor, enforcement of both statutes is in general not strict, although it varies from State to State. The Commission also found that, while eradication of child labor is primarily a State responsibility, few States have adequate child-labor laws applicable to agriculture, and still fewer States have adequately enforced the child-labor laws in existence.

Closely related to the problem of child labor in agriculture is the lack of educational opportunity among migrant children to which I have alluded. The Commission on Migratory Labor concluded that because of the conflict between the nonlocal character of migratory people and the essential local character of the public school system, it is necessary for the Federal Government to give supplementary educational aid to the States with the provision that Federal activities should not compete with or displace locally provided services.

The President's Commission recognizes the outstanding work done in the field of developing migrant-labor facilities by the States of New Jersey, New York, California, Wisconsin, Texas, and Colorado. But again, Mr. Chairman, the Commission points out that the Federal Government has resorted to emergency provisions. No continuity has been provided.

The Commission wisely cautions against a new bureau or agency to serve these requirements. Some of the recommendations follow:

We recommend that—

- (1) There be established a Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor, to be appointed by and responsible to the President.
- (2) The committee be composed of 3 public members and 1 member from each of the following agencies: Department of Agriculture, Department of Labor, Department of State, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Federal Security Agency.
- (3) The public members be appointed by the President. One public member should serve full time as chairman and the other two on a part-time basis. The Government representatives should be appointed by the President on the nomination of the heads of the respective agencies. The committee should have authority, within the limits of

its appropriation, to establish such advisory committees as it deems necessary.

(4) The Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor have the authority and responsibility, with adequate staff and funds to assist, coordinate, and stimulate the various agencies of the Government in their activities and policies relating to migratory farm labor, including such investigations and publications as will contribute to an understanding of migratory farm labor problems, and to recommend to the President, from time to time, such changes in administration and legislation as may be required to facilitate improvements in the policies of the Government relating to migratory farm labor. The committee should undertake such specific responsibilities as are assigned to it in the recommendations set forth in this report and as may be assigned to it by the President.

In general, however, the committee should have no administrative or operating responsibilities; these should remain within the respective established agencies and departments.

(5) Similar agencies be established in the various States. The responsibilities and the activities of the Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor and those of the agencies established in the States should be complementary and not competitive. The State agencies should be encouraged to carry forward those programs in behalf of migratory farm workers which, by their nature, fall within the responsibility of individual States. The Federal committee will have major concern with interstate, national, and international activities. But at all times there should be close consultation between the Federal and State agencies and a two-way flow of information, suggestions, and effective cooperation.

I call attention to the above recommendations because I believe we will continue to be plagued by these problems unless we set in motion at the Federal level remedial procedures to reduce in severity the evils associated with these conditions. There is no basic conflict between our interest and Mexico's, between the employer and those seeking to sell their labor, between the Southwest and the other regions of our country. It is indeed a national problem and it must be met.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

(Mr. MILLER of Kansas and Mr. METCALF asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. BAILEY.)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, when this initial legislation was approved in 1951 I opposed it on the ground that there was written into the legislation a provision exempting these Mexican immigrant workers from the payment of income taxes and exempting them from participation and inclusion under the Social Security Act.

I was interested in what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] said about Mexican workers making more than school teachers. If that is true, they ought to be paying income taxes.

Mexico has abrogated the provisions of the agreement. This resolution here would provide for negotiating directly by the farm people at the border with the Mexican laborers themselves.

Under the agreement we have with Mexico these workers were guaranteed a minimum wage, they were guaranteed certain hospital services, they were guar-

anteed unemployment compensation. All of that will be set aside under this new agreement because we are going to deal directly with them, and you will negotiate with them at whatever you want to pay on the border.

With more than 45,000 unemployed people in the State of West Virginia, I would be remiss in my duty if I voted for a piece of legislation to bring in probably two or three hundred thousand additional workers to work on the farms of this country.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Is there any reason to believe that the Mexican Government can set their minimum wages and labor standards better, more fairly, and to greater advantages for these workers than our own Government can?

Mr. BAILEY. That was part of the agreement that was abrogated.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This would provide for it. If we do not provide for it, we will not have anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, with the full understanding and intent that this shall be a part of the legislative history of this bill, I want to clearly state that approval of this joint resolution does not approve the contract the Labor Department has proposed to give to the Mexican workers. Certainly I want it understood that this House is not writing legislative history approving the wording of any contract but is simply authorizing the negotiation of a contract with Mexican workers. I feel that there are provisions in the proposed contract which are not in keeping with the general law of the United States. I would not want this debate to close until it is made abundantly clear for the purpose of the Record that the enactment of this measure does not in any way constitute an approval of article 17 of that contract. It was never the intent of the committee or the Congress that the Secretary of Labor should attempt by contract or otherwise to regulate the dealings between the worker and the employer, except as is provided in section 503 of the act to see that foreign workers cannot be employed as long as domestic workers are available and to see that the employment of foreign workers will not adversely affect wages and working conditions of domestic workers, similarly employed. Other than this, it has always been the intent of this legislation that both the worker and the employer should be left free in their dealings with one another.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude by saying I believe this resolution is of very great importance. It

transcends local considerations. My first objection to it was based on the international implications which I believed and still believe are involved. I know, as the majority leader has said, that this measure is wanted and desired by the administration. I wish to conclude by saying that it is my fondest hope that this resolution will not result in the impairment of our friendship with our good neighbor "South of the Border."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. KEATING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 355) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461-1468), as amended relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, pursuant to House Resolution 450, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. SHELLEY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHELLEY moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 355 to the House Committee on Agriculture.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 156, nays 250, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—156

Abernethy	Carnahan	Forand
Addonizio	Carrigg	Frazier
Andrews	Chudoff	Friedel
Angell	Condon	Fulton
Bailey	Cooley	Garmatz
Baker	Corbett	George
Barrett	Crosser	Gordon
Battle	Curtis, Mass.	Granahan
Becker	Davis, Ga.	Green
Bennett, Fla.	Deane	Gross
Bennett, Mich.	Delaney	Hagen, Calif.
Bishop	Dingell	Haley
Blatnik	Dodd	Hand
Boggs	Dollinger	Hart
Boland	Donohue	Hays, Ohio
Bolling	Donovan	Heller
Bonin	Dorn, N. Y.	Hoffman, Mich.
Bowler	Doyle	Holifield
Boykin	Eberharter	Holtzman
Bray	Elliott	Howell
Brooks, La.	Evins	Jarman
Buchanan	Felghan	Javits
Burdick	Fenton	Johnson, Wis.
Byrd	Fine	Karsten, Mo.
Byrne, Pa.	Fino	Kean
Canfield	Fogarty	Kearns

Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lesinski
Long
McCarthy
McCormack
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Marshall
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan

Moulder
Multer
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmer
Ostertag
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Plost
Philbin
Polk
Powell
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney

NAYS—250

Abblitt
Adair
Albert
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Andresen,
August H.
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Barden
Bates
Beamer
Belcher
Bender
Bentsen
Berry
Betts
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bramblett
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Budge
Burleson
Busbey
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Cannon
Carlyle
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Coon
Cooper
Cotton
Coudert
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Dempsey
Derounian
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dies
Dolliver
Dondero
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Engle
Fernandez
Fisher
Ford

Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Grant
Gregory
Gubser
Gwinn
Hagen, Minn.
Hale
Halleck
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hébert
Herlong
Heseltun
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillelson
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holmes
Holt
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Hruska
Hunter
Hyde
Ikard
Jackson
James
Jenkins
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas, Ill.
Jonas, N. C.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Kilday
King, Pa.
Knox
Laird
Landrum
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Mahon
Mailhard
Martin, Iowa

Saylor
Scott
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sleminski
Spence
Staggers
Sullivan
Tollefson
Van Zandt
Vorys
Wainwright
Walter
Watts
Whitten
Wier
Williams, N. J.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Velde
Vinson
Wampler
Warburton

NOT VOTING—28

Bentley
Broyhill
Buckley
Campbell
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Clardy
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.

Westland
Wharton
Wheeler
Wickersham
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.

Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Tex.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Young
Younger

Roberts
Roosevelt
Sheppard
Simpson, Pa.
Taylor
Vursell
Weichel
Williams, Miss.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Bentley against.
Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Williams of Mississippi against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Chelf against.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois for, with Mr. Krueger against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Jensen with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Clardy with Mr. Campbell.

Mr. Weichel with Mr. Lantaff.

Mr. Vursell with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Richards.

Mr. Broyhill with Mr. Fallon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title, H. R. 7996, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this bill which creates a new way of recruiting foreigners to work in the United States at a time of increasing unemployment here. The present law

at least requires agreement with Mexico. This bill eliminates this limitation. I would not like to see organized Government recruiting of Americans by Canada, or Mexico, for any purpose, just across our borders. I am concerned to see that this policy of bringing in Mexicans and others to do American stoop-labor which was originally a war emergency measure, is becoming a fixed part of our economy, and in this bill is being broadened. Under our present system the Government spends money to bring in foreigners to help raise crops like cotton, then buys the cotton, and then pays unemployment insurance to American workers. It is said that Americans are unwilling to do this work. If we spent money organizing and recruiting and transporting Americans I believe we could get the numbers to raise the crops we really need. Instead, we seem to have drifted into a situation where certain segments of our agriculture are developing vested rights in foreign labor. I admit the problem is complex, but I do not believe we help to solve it by extending this recruiting system, regardless of the consent of a neighboring friendly country, at this time.

EXTENSION OF MAJOR EXCISE TAXES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which extends those excise rates which would otherwise be subject to automatic reduction on April 1. This extension has been requested by the President. The major excises affected are those on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, gasoline, and automobiles. The extension contained in my bill will retain about \$1.1 billion revenue from these sources.

My bill also reduces a number of excise rates on a selective basis. The present law contains a variety of rates ranging up to 25 percent in some cases. There is no rhyme or reason in such a discriminatory system of rates. I believe that no article or service should be subjected to an ad valorem excise tax in excess of 10 percent unless imposed as a penalty. For that reason, the bill which I am introducing reduces to 10 percent all nonpenalty ad valorem excises which are presently above that level. The bill leaves untouched any rates below 10 percent.

This is the effect of the major excise cuts contained in the bill:

First. The tax on luggage, including ladies' handbags, is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Second. The tax on furs, one of the Nation's depressed industries, is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Third. The tax on jewelry, also a depressed industry, is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Fourth. The tax on toilet articles is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Fifth. The tax on admissions, including movie admissions, is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Sixth. The tax on electric-light bulbs is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Seventh. The tax on photographic equipment is cut in half, from 20 to 10 percent.

Eighth. The tax on mechanical pens, pencils, and lighters is cut from 15 to 10 percent.

Ninth. The tax on long-distance telephone calls is cut from 25 to 10 percent.

Tenth. The tax on local telephone calls and telegrams is cut from 15 to 10 percent.

Eleventh. The tax on sporting goods is cut from 15 to 10 percent.

The above excise cuts will relieve the Nation's consumers of close to \$1 billion a year in excise taxes. This will give needed stimulation immediately to consumer-purchasing power. It will give immediate stimulation to the Nation's business and to employment. Furthermore, the rate changes will provide a more equitable tax system, by leveling down those rates which are now excessively high and discriminatory.

I prepared this excise bill several months ago. However, I have delayed introduction of the bill until today because premature announcement of excise cuts can have an adverse effect upon business conditions. It is very easy to encourage a buyers' strike on the part of consumers. Now that the bill has been introduced, I think it is essential that Congress act with speed and decision on this vital legislation.

PROGRAM FOR SENDING FREEDOM MESSAGES BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, after World War II the United States took almost sole responsibility in providing relief and rehabilitation to the millions of victims of the most tragic war of all time. We have always stood as a symbol of hope to the destitute and the oppressed. Today, because of subsequent developments in Eastern Europe, a large number of these people are in a geographic and political isolation unprecedented in history for its effectiveness. Not only have these people been cut off from all contact with the Western World, of which they are traditionally a part, but they have been subjected to a steady barrage of lies from the Kremlin's master propagandists in an attempt to destroy the last vestiges of democratic tradition. We must let these people know once again that the bonds which unite freedom-loving men all over the world transcend all boundaries and obstacles. If we do not, we shall completely lose these enslaved millions to the forces of communism. Our task is to give them new courage to resist the brain washing

that they have undergone for so long, and to alleviate their physical suffering, no matter in how small a measure.

My honored colleague, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, introduced a joint resolution in the Senate, February 23—Senate Joint Resolution 131—calling for the appropriation of \$2 million to be used to send balloons carrying freedom messages and small packets of freedom food to the satellite countries.

Several years ago the columnist, Drew Pearson, and Harold E. Stassen, now Director of FOA, carried out a similar campaign. This program actually succeeded in sending 11 million balloon-borne messages beyond the Iron Curtain. There can be no doubt that these words of freedom from the West did considerable damage to the Communist regimes in these countries. A program, such as the one proposed by Senator DOUGLAS, would be of tremendous value in corroding the Iron Curtain and thus, in a very effective way, would break through the barrier that the Communists have set up between their satellites and the free world.

Because it is a means of reaching individuals in the most direct way possible, its value as a weapon in the cold war should not be overlooked. Furthermore, it would be virtually impossible for the Communists to put a complete stop to such a campaign.

Our distribution of food to the starving people of East Berlin, although restricted in its application by the barriers thrown up by the Soviet occupying forces, shows how effective such a campaign can be against communism.

Only by constantly keeping the truth alive can we hope to destroy the danger of the Moscow fabricated lies which is one of the greatest threats to the free world. Only by proving to the people of the Iron Curtain countries that we have not forgotten them can we expect to retain them as our friends. Only by helping them can we keep alive their hope for eventual liberation. A program contributing a campaign of truth with the tangible evidence of our friendship which would be provided by small food packages should make a significant contribution to these ends. I therefore am pleased to join myself with this cause and to introduce in this Chamber a joint resolution authorizing the formulation and carrying out of a program for sending freedom messages behind the Iron Curtain.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE OFFSHORE PROCUREMENT PROGRAM

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I desire during this time that has been granted me to express my very grave concern about a subject that is being sadly glossed over from day to day here in the Congress and I refer to the continuing increase in the ranks of the unemployed.

As Shakespeare said in Hamlet, "To be or not to be, that is the question."

When is this administration going to take off its rose-colored glasses and face up to the facts of just what is taking place in our economy from day to day?

My district in Minnesota has had an alarming growth of the unemployed beginning back last September when over 1,200 employees were thrown out of work by one of our largest manufacturing plants engaged in farm machinery and tractors. This has been followed by many more cutbacks in lesser plants as well as a general slowdown in the construction industry.

Now the Government itself has instituted the worst layoff of all and has issued orders to its large ordnance plants in the Twin City area to remove, by June 1, around 6,000 to 7,000 employees from gainful employment. That applies only to the Minneapolis-St. Paul area and because that order has been decreed for all their shell plants around the Nation, I am sure that many more Members of the House are likewise feeling the impact of unemployment. This layoff also will affect employment in several of the feeder plants that have contracts with the ordnance plant.

As of today, I am in receipt of communications from hundreds of these employees or former employees whose chief reaction surely appears to be a justified complaint because they know only too well that in 1952 the Congress appropriated a little over \$1 billion for the offshore procurement program in order that military contracts could be made to have the production and manufacture of war material, supplies, shells, explosives, and so forth, all made in countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa by the workers of those countries and with our tax money, much of which comes from taxes paid by the workers now being thrown out of employment.

Do they have a complaint or do they not? You ask them. Their communications are the answer and as for myself, I am concerned and have prepared this statement as to my findings on the subject as well as my position in support of their reaction.

With regard to money and taxes that are voted by the Congress for the foreign production of shells and all other necessary military hardware, such as all ammunition, explosives, guns, and so forth, this seems to be one of the questions that bothers and concerns the workers being laid off at the ordnance plants the most.

Here is what I know and likewise have learned after a very thorough checkup and investigation of my own.

Almost \$1 billion was voted a year ago for the offshore procurement contracts to our friendly allies. These funds are voted as appropriations to the mutual defense assistance program of foreign military aid and are in the main administered under the direction of Harold Stassen, Foreign Operations Administration.

Offshore procurement is the purchase by the United States Armed Forces of military supplies and equipment from sources in Europe, the Near East, and north Africa. Such equipment and supplies may be used as part of the United States military aid program to NATO

and non-NATO countries such as Yugoslavia.

Ammunition and explosives took the largest part of these contracts that were turned over by Mr. Stassen. Next came contracts for aircraft and equipment, contracts for ships, and contracts for vehicles—other than transport—like-wise, contracts for electronic equipment.

Involved were some 350 prime contractors of 15 nations, producing hundreds of items from complete aircraft and tanks to .30-caliber ammunition. After getting these contracts and money from Mr. Stassen, the Army placed the bulk of the contracts, both in number and total, of 141.

This offshore procurement is part of overall procurement under the mutual defense assistance program and was started in the fiscal year 1952 with a total of funds obligated to the program of just over \$600 million. The purposes of this plan, so they then said and still say, were to, first, increase Europe's long-run industrial self-sufficiency; second, to broaden Europe's industrial mobilization base, putting the producer nearer the consumer for strategic, political, and economic reasons; third, to help meet military needs more effectively.

In addition, it has also been said by the proponents that there were a lot of lesser principles, too, such as manpower utilization, supplementing United States production. It now not only supplements; it supplants. That is the one that hurts our American workers today. Also, to increase European productivity and helping in an important way to relieve the European dollar shortage.

Now, that is a very brief outline of my knowledge and what I have learned of the offshore procurement program up to now. However, may I say this program is coming back to haunt the military production workers of our own country because the shooting war is in a stage of truce and therefore the need for military production has been, and is continuing to be, cut back, resulting in many of the military ordnance production plants laying off thousands of our own workers all over this Nation and adding them to an already fast-growing army of unemployed.

That being true, what do we do now to curb this threat of serious unemployment? My first step in that direction was to call on two officers of the Ordnance Department of the Army. Their only answer to me with regard to these cutbacks to a single shift at both the Twin City Ordnance and Donovan plants was that they had received these instructions or orders from higher up in the Pentagon and had no other choice than to follow orders like the good soldiers they are. At the same time they advised me that all their ordnance plants making various types of caliber shells were all being advised of these orders and were being required to make the same layoffs.

My next effort was a call to Mr. Nash, Chief of the Foreign Production and Procurement Division. I found Mr. Nash to be not only very courteous but cooperative, and likewise sympathetic to the plight of these thousands that were being tossed out of employment.

He informed me that his agency and the military Chiefs of Staff are concerned with the unemployment situation as well as the fact that these layoff orders have had to be issued and because of the growing seriousness of our whole national economy. Mr. Nash advised me that no contracts have been let by his agency since June 30, 1953, for offshore procurement, including all ammunition, and that he has been holding up \$22 million worth of contracts that should have been approved because he feels the White House and the military will have to take some decisive and remedial action soon.

To all those employees of the Twin City Ordnance who have lost their employment or have received their notice of dismissal and written to me, I can only say I have and shall continue to use my efforts to correct this evil with which our American workers are now confronted. If President Eisenhower and his administration do not realize what is taking place throughout the length and breadth of this Nation and take steps to check this increasing trend of unemployment, then of course I shall, as one of the 435 Members of the House, have only one alternative and that is to oppose and vote against any and all funds for these agencies that are dealing out our jobs all over the world, except of course to our own American workers.

This I can and shall have to do when the appropriation bills come before the House in the near future.

MISSOURI DROUGHT EMERGENCY PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am quoting for the consideration of the House the portion of the address of Gov. Phil M. Donnelly to the 67th General Assembly of Missouri, extra session, which deals with the Missouri drought emergency program:

On October 19, 128 days ago, this general assembly met in extraordinary session to deal at that time with the public calamity which had befallen the State of Missouri as a result of the most prolonged and devastating drought in the history of our State. The people of Missouri have a right to be proud of this general assembly for the speed and unanimity of action which it took at that time to meet the public calamity. In that extraordinary session, this general assembly authorized the establishment of a program for bringing into and distributing within the State hay and roughage for the feeding of livestock by the citizens of Missouri. To carry out such a program, the general assembly appropriated \$6,500,000 out of the general revenue fund, and also appropriated any grants received from the Federal Government for such program, with the proviso that the amount of such Federal grants should be deducted from the appropriation of State funds.

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by that legislation to establish such a program, on October 26, 1953, I promulgated an executive order establishing the Missouri drought

emergency program and providing rules and regulations for the operation thereof. Within just 8 days after the convening of the general assembly, the program was established and under way, with vitally needed hay moving into the State.

The success of the program has thus far exceeded our best hopes and expectations. Its success can be attributed to the manifold efforts of thousands of Missouri citizens who have worked long and diligently to make this program succeed. The gratitude of Missouri must be extended to the more than 800 authorized dealers, who handled and financed the purchase and distribution of hay and roughage under this program, to the county extension agents who cooperated in helping to administer it, and to the railroad industry which not only reduced its rates, but, in addition, cooperated splendidly in the movement of such tremendous quantities of hay. We were fortunate because unusually large quantities of surplus hay were available in other States and our gratitude goes out to our friends and neighbors in other States who were willing to sell the hay at a reasonable price. Without the cooperative efforts of all these people, and many others, this program could not have succeeded as it has to date.

The success of the program up to this time is vividly demonstrated by the fact that on February 15, 1954, a total of 571,246 tons of hay had been moved into the State, at a total cost for transportation of \$6,430,849.08, which has been or is in the process of being paid. When the program was authorized by the general assembly, it was estimated that 500,000 tons of hay and roughage was the maximum amount which could be purchased and physically moved into the State. It was anticipated that \$6½ million would be required to pay transportation costs on this tonnage. Therefore, we may well be proud of two results, first, that we have been able to move more hay into Missouri than it was thought physically possible, and, second, that the cost of transporting such hay into Missouri is less than we anticipated.

This immense movement of hay into Missouri is hard to visualize. Under this program, 39,401 railroad cars of hay, and 1,027 truck loads of hay have been moved into the State. A total of 80,896 farmers in our 114 counties have been issued certificates to obtain desperately needed hay.

This program has been beneficial to all citizens, for agriculture is our basic industry. Hundreds of thousands of cattle which would have been sacrificed upon glutted markets are, as a result of this program, still upon Missouri farms. Every Missourian would have felt the effects in some measure had our livestock industry been severely crippled by the awful drought. Thousands of farm families who faced financial ruin have been saved. The adverse economic effects to business of every kind in the State have, in a large degree, been alleviated.

Unfortunately, however, the prolonged and devastating drought has not yet been broken. Many farmers still do not have sufficient quantities of hay and roughage to carry their livestock through until grass is available this spring. Many farmers, due to their financial condition, have only been able to buy hay in small quantities.

The State department of agriculture made a survey of all authorized dealers to determine the extent to which available appropriated funds would complete the program. That survey indicated that the available funds of \$6½ million would not be adequate to bring into the State the hay and roughage needed to carry livestock through until spring.

Fully realizing that no funds in excess of \$6½ million could be expected to carry on this program without action by this general assembly, the State commissioner of agriculture, with my approval, notified all authorized dealers handling hay that the

State would not approve claims for reimbursement until further notice.

Thereupon, I wired the appointed leaders of both parties of both houses of this general assembly to obtain their opinion on legislation to make available the Federal funds which had been granted to Missouri, or may in the future be granted, as an addition to the State appropriation of \$6,500,000. The overwhelming majority of the replies which I received stated they favored such legislation. Relying on this assurance and realizing the urgent need of hay supplies by our farmers, I ordered the program resumed and continued.

I am sure that the primary objective of all of us is the success of this program. This objective transcends all partisan political considerations. Unless this program is continued until spring, much of the benefit thus far achieved may well be lost.

It now appears, following a survey of all authorized dealers and county extension agents, that in order to successfully complete the program, every effort should be made to move an additional 225,000 tons of hay into the State before spring. Based upon average transportation costs in effect at this time, the transportation costs on this tonnage of hay will amount to approximately \$3,600,000.

I recommend, therefore, that House bill 2, enacted by the 67th general assembly, 1953 extra session, approved October 23, 1953, be amended so that Federal grants which have been received or may yet be received by the State may be expended for this program in addition to the amounts appropriated out of the general revenue fund of the State.

I recommend that House bill 2 be further amended to increase the amount appropriated out of the general revenues fund of the State from \$6,500,000 to \$8,500,000.

If these amendments are enacted, an additional \$3,604,000 will be made available to continue and carry out the Missouri drought emergency program. Of this amount, \$1,604,000 will be Federal funds received or to be received and \$2 million will be additional State funds.

Any funds remaining unexpended upon the termination of this program will be returned to the State treasury.

A full and complete audit of the operations of this entire program cannot, of course, be made until it has been finally concluded and terminated. However, a preliminary or summary audit has been made by the State auditor of the operations of the program from its inception to January 31, 1954, which is available to the general assembly. At the conclusion of the program, a complete audit will be made, and it also will be available to the general assembly.

I am pleased to report that this program has been efficiently and economically administered by the State department of agriculture. Therefore, no additional administrative appropriation is required. However, due to the fact that the work of concluding, terminating, and auditing the program will necessarily extend beyond June 30, 1954, I recommend that House bill 2 be amended to authorize the expenditure until December 31, 1954, of funds already appropriated for administrative expense.

Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed with the manner in which the State of Missouri under a Democrat governor and senate and Republican lower house has moved forward in conjunction with various citizens organizations to meet this great disaster to our State.

Essentially, tragedies of this sort must remain the problems of the State and local governments and their citizenry. To treat them otherwise would be to weaken the moral fiber of our people. However, the Federal Government should be ready to be of ancillary assistance

when these tragedies reach great proportions as they sometimes do and as is the case presently in Missouri.

I believe that the Federal Government has been of great ancillary assistance to the State of Missouri and its people in meeting this tragedy. There have been instances where the State authorities and the Federal authorities were in disagreement. In one particular instance I backed up the State authorities although I thought the Federal decision was the better, solely because I felt that the State should have the right of decision and the Federal Government should remain in the ancillary role.

I take the trouble to set this forth on the floor of the House because since the drought hit Missouri certain Democrat Members in the United States Congress from Missouri have been going from one end of the State to the other crying out that the Federal Government was not meeting its obligations, completely ignoring what the Governor of the State might have had to say on the subject of what help was needed by the State from the Federal Government.

In other words, the attempt seemed to be to persuade the citizens of Missouri that the Federal Government was the first place to look for help and not the State government. The attempt disregarded the position of the Governor of the State and other State officials.

Now I ask for an end to this partisanship. Governor Donnelly has well stated it:

I am sure that the primary objective of all of us is the success of this program. This objective transcends all partisan political considerations.

I have assured Governor Donnelly that I stand ready and willing to be of any assistance I can as a Member of the Federal legislative body to supplement the State program where he feels it needs supplementing and it is proper for the Federal Government to do so.

I believe the proper procedure for all representatives from Missouri in the Congress, both the House and the Senate, is to work with the State program under the leadership of the Governor and the State officials in an ancillary manner and not to go around promoting programs which may or may not fit with the State program.

If there are Members of the Congress from Missouri who disagree with this procedure, then I say indeed we have a fair political issue. It is the issue of the relationship of the Federal Government to the State government, not the issue, as they might like to have it, of who is concerned about solving the plight of Missouri farmers who have been afflicted by this terrible drought. Let us resolve this issue and if it is one of States' rights let us see which side of the fence my Democrat colleagues are sitting on. They cannot sit on both sides any longer.

NEW ENGLAND TO BE BYPASSED AGAIN?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, during all the debate on the St. Lawrence Seaway, I have heard no arguments put forward to prove that it will help New England.

The omission is eloquent.

The stark fact is that the Northeastern States will be further isolated from the Union by Federal action if this legislation is passed.

We hear lofty statements imploring us to be guided by the national interest on this and other issues and I sincerely wish this could be so. Behind this smoke screen, however, sectional interests are working feverishly to gain advantages for certain regions.

Perhaps we could overlook this, if the claims of each region, in turn, were given consideration, and help in the true national interest. We have subsidized the farmers for a long time. We have used Federal funds to develop the South and the West. I do not propose to criticize these programs, if due consideration and assistance is finally given to the economic problems of New England.

But when neglect of our just claims is compounded by legislation that, in helping others, will harm our region, then we must protest and vigorously.

The administration, deaf to our appeals for cooperation in effecting the economic rebirth of our mill cities that are losing their factories to the Southern States, is manifesting a lively interest in supporting the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

Our seaports and railroads are having a difficult enough time as it is, without being choked off by a project which will divert imports and exports to an inland seaway that is largely under the control of a neighboring nation.

We resent being taxed to put ourselves out of business.

We shall fight against any further move to squeeze our hard-pressed economy.

An inland seaway offers no alternate routes, in case of a traffic tieup, or if it is immobilized by an enemy attack. It is useless for 5 months of the year when it is icebound. It is intended to accelerate the shipment of Canadian wheat and ores, and would only be of secondary help to special interests in the United States.

It is estimated that 30 percent of Boston's foreign trade would be lost to the seaway. If legitimate business is drained off during 7 months of the year, we cannot expect eastern railroads and seaports to remain efficient on a standby basis, and be ready to serve the needs of the United States in any emergency that might arise.

Speaking of the national interest, what about our national defense, if the facilities that we depended upon in the past, are weakened by diversion of traffic to the seaway?

As the Boston Post observed in its editorial of January 22, 1954:

The big argument for the seaway, and the biggest switch in votes, was in relation to the development of the Labrador-Quebec

iron deposits when the Mesabi Range deposits began to thin out.

The man who had most to do with the planning and investment in the development of the Labrador-Quebec iron deposits is George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, but formerly top executive of the Hanna Co., of Ohio, which has an enormous investment in the Labrador ore field.

At this point I suggest that help for the New England economy merits priority over a project intended to improve a major transport facility in a foreign land.

To make the expense of it appear inconsequential, they say it would only cost us \$105 million. A few years back, however, when costs were lower, Congress was told that the initial outlay would be \$800 million, with the probability that extras would raise it much higher.

In the new look that has become fashionable in Washington, which they would like us to slavishly copy, it is considered old fashioned to mention domestic or sectional problems, but it is the height of style to buy any foreign design, no matter how expensive or harmful it may be to us.

If the Federal Government cannot afford to spend 1 cent to help the labor-surplus areas of New England to effect an economic transition, how can it, with any logic or consistency, advocate the eventual spending of billions on a Canadian project that Canada will build anyway?

The answer to that calls for the defeat of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and special orders heretofore entered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. When does the gentleman expect to go to conference on this bill?

Mr. TABER. Tomorrow morning.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, PHILLIPS, CLEVENGER, CANNON, and THOMAS.

INCREASING THE BORROWING POWER OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 459, Rept. 1264) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7339) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all those who spoke on House Joint Resolution 355 today may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in announcing the program for this week I stated that if additional rules were granted we would try to dispose of them this week. Rules have been filed on H. R. 7328, dealing with research facilities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, from the Armed Services Committee; H. R. 6788, soil conservation and watershed projects; H. R. 7339, to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

We propose tomorrow to call the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriation bill. My impression about it is that we can conclude that bill tomorrow evening. Some Members have some commitments for Thursday, which I know about and which we will do our best to protect.

The Kersten resolution, which is an extension of the committee operations investigating the situation back of the Iron Curtain in the Baltic countries will come up and be disposed of on Thursday.

As I say, my information is that these particular matters are not controversial,

so I hope we can dispose of them on Thursday and Friday.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Some Members are interested in what order these resolutions will be taken up. Some Members are very much interested in the so-called Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman would prefer, I would be very happy to arrange as of now that the Commodity Credit Corporation bill be taken up on Friday, rather than on Thursday, and dispose of these other matters on Thursday.

Mr. RAYBURN. If something controversial comes up on Thursday, would you put the vote over until Friday, to accommodate the delegation from Virginia?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. I will undertake to do that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therewith extraneous matter; and that my remarks follow the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF TEXAS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that this is March 2, a great day in the history of the great State of Texas. It was on March 2, 1836, that Texas patriots threw off the yoke of despotism and declared its independence, and became a member of the family of the nations of the world.

That declaration was made secure at the Alamo, at Goliad, and at San Jacinto in subsequent weeks where gallantry, sacrifice, and courage were displayed on those occasions in fashion seldom equaled in all the history of mankind. Devotion to principle was paramount in the minds of those patriots. Texans today, joined, I am sure, by their fellow Americans, in all humility, pay tribute to the memory of these great and good men.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission that the special order he had for today be postponed to Thursday.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes, to revise and extend my

remarks, and include extraneous matter. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a certain reluctance to discuss a somewhat delicate subject. In the first place, as our Chaplain said at the opening of the session today, "Our hearts are wrung with sorrow" at the tragic episode which occurred here yesterday. Under present circumstances it is not easy to proceed with other business. Perhaps we should be thankful that more people were not injured by that violent and fanatical attack. We grieve, however, for all those who were injured, and especially for my close friend, ALVIN BENTLEY, of Michigan. I am sure all the Members of this body earnestly wish him a speedy recovery.

As a junior member of this body it perhaps is not entirely appropriate that I call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to a serious situation. It is, however, because this situation is serious, and because it needs the urgent and intensive consideration of every member of this body that I have decided to discuss the matter.

I refer to the necessity of setting up promptly more adequate rules of procedure for our investigating committees. The Nation's attention during the past week has been called all too vividly to serious defects in congressional procedures. In my opinion immediate and serious self-examination of the methods by which our investigating committees operate is in order. It is likewise timely to consider promptly how effective our basic investigating committee organization has been.

Unless we here in Congress can promptly and effectively handle the problems with which we have been dramatically presented, the prestige and respect of the legislative branch itself may be damaged. For effective representative government, it is essential that the people maintain their respect for, and faith in, their governmental institutions, particularly their Congress. For that reason it is time to look into the methods of operation of our investigating committees.

The distinguished majority leader in the other body, Senator KNOWLAND, of California, has recently proposed that the Senate policy committee make a full study of the rules of their investigating committees. As we know, the subcommittee of our own Rules Committee, under the leadership of my able colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], is already studying bills providing for a fair code of rules and procedures for the protection of witnesses. It is my hope that every Member of this body will take a real interest in proposals which may be forthcoming from this committee.

I should like to mention briefly a few of the events last week which made headlines in every newspaper in this country, and which precipitated the present situation. I refer of course to the arbitrary treatment given a fine Army officer before an investigating committee. For the record, I should like to state that this officer, Brig. Gen.

Ralph W. Zwicker, is commanding general at Camp Kilmer, which is located in the district which I represent in Congress. As a further item of information, the Secretary of the Army, Robert T. Stevens, who promptly criticized the humiliating treatment accorded General Zwicker, is a constituent of mine.

I feel so strongly about this affair, however, not because of these facts. Involved is the prestige of the great party to which I belong. Furthermore, as I have said already, the prestige and good name of Congress are affected when investigating committees abuse their power. Prompt action is needed to correct this situation.

And now I should like again to mention briefly the treatment which General Zwicker received from a one-man congressional investigating committee. First of all, I should like to make my own position clear. I believe the treatment accorded General Zwicker was unjustifiable. I feel he personally is owed an apology. It appears inexcusable that a man in uniform should be publicly pilloried, especially by a congressional committee, for obeying orders issued by his superior. The quarrel, if any, involves the officer's superior—in this case Secretary of the Army Stevens.

I feel sure that nobody in either body of Congress questions the right of investigating committees to have sufficient authority to make needed inquiries, and their right to exercise this authority. The right of Congress to investigate is not in issue. Their methods, however, definitely are in issue.

Our form of government is one of checks and balances. The legislative branch should not interfere unduly with the exercise of power by the executive branch. General Zwicker was simply carrying out orders in refusing to answer certain questions. Secretary of the Army Stevens made it plain that he would answer instead. There was no excuse here for the abuse to which General Zwicker was subjected.

Self-restraint and self-discipline by the Members of Congress, individually and collectively, normally will prevent unjustifiable forays such as last week's episode. The executive branch is as interested as are we in rooting subversives out of official positions. Secretary of the Army Stevens has repeatedly made this clear. The chairman of the Republican National Committee, Leonard Hall, pointed out at a press conference only today that he did not think anyone would say that generals in our Army are not fighting communism. Secretary Stevens has indicated unequivocally that he will cooperate fully with congressional committees. Quite naturally, however, he is very much opposed to browbeating and unnecessary abuse of military personnel, even by congressional committees.

This recent abuse of the authority and legitimate exercise of power by congressional committees emphasizes the urgent need for us to put our own house in order. It should be a first order of business. We may then proceed to the consideration of other urgent legislative business.

But, it may be argued, the investigating committees of the House are not subject to this criticism. I should like now to mention briefly our own Committee on Un-American Activities. Last Thursday its respected chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], discussed the rules of this committee. At the conclusion of his remarks, \$275,000 was voted to continue actively the work of this committee for another year.

The achievements of this committee should be commended, and I joined in voting for further appropriations. There is, however, no room for members of this body to be complacent about our investigating committees' procedures, at least if past experience is any guide. There have been incidents of ill-advised action, made possible by inadequate procedures.

In conclusion, I should like to mention briefly a joint resolution which I introduced nearly 2 months ago, on the opening day of this session. It is House Joint Resolution 328. It provides for a Joint Committee on Internal Security, which would have exclusive jurisdiction over all matters involving subversive and un-American activities.

In my opinion such a committee would enable us to operate more efficiently and economically, without the duplication of effort and the competition for witnesses such as now occurs. My colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I understand, yesterday introduced a similar resolution proposing a joint committee. At this point I should like to include Mr. JAVITS' article, "For a Joint Committee on Internal Security," which appeared in the New York Times of February 28. It describes admirably some of the problems which we face today, and discusses one way in which improvements can be made in our congressional machinery.

FOR A JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBVERSION

(By Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS)

Congressional investigations aimed at finding Communists, subversives, and loyalty risks in and out of government have aroused one of the most heated controversies ever heard in this country. So great a stir have they made that there is even argument within the party in power over whether communism at home, instead of the numerous other domestic and foreign problems facing the Nation, is to be the chief issue of this year's congressional elections.

The question is not whether there is a need to investigate communism and subversion; the question, rather, is of the methods employed. These methods greatly trouble millions of Americans who are sensible of our historic traditions of jurisprudence and who are concerned at the growing threat they pose to our civil liberties.

Some of these investigations have taken on the nature of prosecution of witnesses or persons mentioned by witnesses, resulting in subsequent loss of livelihood, reputation, and social standing. Some have compromised the conduct of the Nation's foreign policy. Some have undermined the morale of employees in our own Government and have struck at discipline in the Army.

Lately we have had the grave situation of a top administration officer, Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens, taking issue with Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY over the conduct of an investigation by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which brought a charge from the Secretary that the Senator's methods in investigating

Army security resulted in unwarranted abuse of our loyal officers.

Such results involve major questions of over-all national policy—not alone the finding of Communists and subversives. They certainly go beyond the authority generally vested in the individual investigating committee. They involve the responsibility of Congress as a whole.

It is noteworthy, too, that additional laws to be sought by the administration would enlarge the area of investigative activity. These include laws of the Federal use of wiretapping in espionage cases, to compel testimony by a grant of immunity from prosecution even where the privilege against self-incrimination is pleaded, and for loss of citizenship in case of conviction under the Smith Act for advocating or conspiring to advocate overthrow of the Government by force.

It is clear that a reform of congressional investigating committee methods is badly needed and that we must seek ways more in keeping with traditional concepts of justice to reach our objectives. At the same time we must not lose sight of the objectives or of the dangers which created them. We have had many evidences of the fact that even our country is not immune from the sinister Communist effort to overthrow free government by unconstitutional means and to fasten upon us and the rest of the world the yoke of Communist slavery.

It should be stressed that the problem, therefore, is not whether there is a danger to be dealt with; the problem is how this should be done with the greatest effectiveness and security in keeping with our Nation's foreign and domestic policy, and yet with justice to the individual in compliance with constitutional safeguards. Two new methods have been suggested and are under consideration.

One is that we should follow the practice of the Royal Commission which is in effect in Great Britain and Canada for similar investigations. The most prominent example of the commission's work was the sensational Gouzenko case in Canada in 1946 which brought about the conviction of the atomic scientists, Allan Nunn May and Klaus Fuchs and others engaged in espionage for Soviet Russia. This did much to arouse our authorities to the dangers of subversive activities in this country.

The other suggestion is to entrust these investigations to a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives. This would certainly be a great improvement over the present procedure of individual investigating committees of each House. In my opinion it would attain the desired results, and, for reasons having to do with our form of government which will be discussed later, I prefer it to an American counterpart of the Royal Commission. Consideration of the idea is especially pertinent now, since investigations already carried on have dealt pretty thoroughly with the history of attempted subversion and Communist infiltration and have shown that the chances of successful attempts are being greatly lessened.

Under this plan a joint committee of 12 or 14 members would be established, with equal representation from each House. A chairman and a vice chairman would be chosen by the members, without regard to the seniority rule followed by the present investigating committees. The chairmanship would alternate, with each Congress, between Senate and House. This fact, together with the broad base such a joint committee would have, gives assurance that the head of the committee would be one to whom responsibilities could safely be entrusted.

The resolution establishing the joint committee would also set up rules of fair procedure for its operations and to safeguard individuals. The committee would be financed by appropriations from each of the

Houses, which have funds available from the legislative budget for this purpose. It would be given the power of subpoenas by each House and would otherwise operate as if it were a committee of either House.

Such is the gist of the idea. But why, it may be asked, would this be superior to the current investigating procedure by separate committees? How would it avoid the present excesses? The answer to these questions provides several good reasons why the plan should be adopted.

First, a joint committee would eliminate the duplication of effort as between the committees functioning separately in the House and the Senate as they now do. Even more important, it would eliminate the competition between the various committees to get the headlines by making sensational charges, of which we have seen some regrettable examples—as in the investigation of the Fort Monmouth Signal Corps Research Center or the competitive effort to get jurisdiction for investigation, as in the Harry Dexter White case.

Competition of this kind is certainly not conducive to the dignity and prestige of the Congress, which is at stake in the actions of investigating committees. Indeed, this is one of the fundamental reasons for a change to joint committee responsibility in this field.

Second, a joint committee would have the benefit of the prestige which is traditionally and especially associated with this type of body and could proceed with greater substance and orderliness in this highly sensitive area of investigation. The added prestige involves an intangible, psychological factor of considerable importance; the eyes of the Congress watch the operations of a joint committee more closely than that of a separate committee.

One of the outstanding examples of the prestige enjoyed by a joint committee is the responsibility vested in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has conducted in the utmost secrecy investigations of great moment to the security of this country and of the free world. This group, which is charged with as great a responsibility as Congress has ever given to any committee, could well be a model for the handling of subversion.

Thus, the joint committee, unshackled by the rule of seniority which now prevails as to the special or legislative committees of each House, would function under rules of fair procedure. These rules would correct some glaring deficiencies shown by the present methods of investigating communism and subversion and should give assurance that, regardless of personalities, excesses will be avoided. They would:

Provide for a clear statement of the legislative objective sought in the investigation.

Call for executive hearings to establish witnesses' credibility and to screen the evidence before the holding of public sessions which are likely to result in charges against individuals.

Insure the right of a witness, or of one adversely mentioned by a witness, to make a reasonable statement in his own defense and the right to a reasonable cross-examination and presentation of testimony to rebut testimony adversely affecting his reputation.

Require that no individual member of the committee, including a chairman or an employee, release for publication reports or charges or material from a committee file except that which is substantiated and is authorized for release by a majority of the whole committee.

Require that broadcasting or televising of the examination of witnesses whose reputation is at stake, or those whom they call in defense, be permitted only with the consent of the witness.

This reform of rules of procedures, which already has the support of leading bar associations, including those of New York, Bos-

ton, and the District of Columbia, and of a great section of the public, is under active study in Congress. Even the present committees investigating Communism and subversion see the justice in the demand for rules in view of the jeopardy to individuals in such investigations and, indeed, have formulated some rules themselves. But the rules are either inadequate or, being self-promulgated, are not given that enforcement in letter and spirit which a mandate of the whole Congress is more likely to produce.

The idea for a joint committee to investigate subversion and Communism is now the subject of measures pending in Congress. It is considered favorably by a number of Members of both Houses, including at least one member of the Un-American Activities Committee, and the whole question of rules of fair procedures is now under consideration by a subcommittee of the House Rules Committee whose chairman is Representative HUGH SCOTT, JR., of Pennsylvania.

The value of the joint committee as an institution has been recognized since the first Congress in 1789. There are a number of joint committees of great importance now in existence, among them the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which is charged with considering the President's annual assessment of the economic condition of the country, and the Joint Committees on Internal Revenue Taxation, Defense Production, Immigration and Nationality, and on Printing.

George B. Galloway of the Library of Congress, an outstanding authority on American Government, says of them: "Joint committees have been used at intervals from the earliest days of the Republic, mainly for ceremonial and routine administrative purposes and for conduct of investigations." He notes that they flourished during the Civil War and reconstruction period when they were formed to investigate the conduct of the war and other matters of great importance at that time. He points out that the joint committee is also a valuable instrument of legislative surveillance and statutory amendment in experimental and controversial fields where economic stability and national security are at stake. This is certainly applicable to the investigation of subversion and communism.

Such investigations are not new. They date back to 1919. A famous committee of the 1930's was the McCormack-Dickstein committee, which was organized to study communism and fascism here. The Un-American Activities Committee is, of course, well known and had its origin in a change of the rules of the House of Representatives in 1938. But what touched off the spate of postwar investigations of subversion in the United States was undoubtedly the previously referred-to Gouzenko case. This case illustrates some of the differences in the handling of investigations by a royal commission and by our separate committees.

As many remember, Igor Gouzenko, a code clerk in the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa, broke away from communism in September 1945 and submitted to the Canadian Government documents which he had taken from the files of the Soviet Embassy showing beyond question an enormous espionage plan carried on in Canada by the U. S. S. R. A Royal commission appointed to investigate the whole situation. It consisted of two justices of the Supreme Court of Canada.

The commission set in secret for 5 months, it had the power of subpoena, and it was required to inquire into and report upon which public officials and other persons in position of trust had given away secret information to foreign agents, and the circumstances surrounding the acts. In a manner not untypical of Canadian and British justice, the commission made reasonable accommodations to rules of procedure without by so doing impairing its activity.

Representation of witnesses by counsel, for instance, was generally allowed but was considered discretionary. Although the members of the commission had doubts as to the right of any witness to claim immunity under the Canada Evidence Act on the grounds of self-incrimination (in view of the special terms under which they were proceeding), they nevertheless imposed no penalty for refusal to testify. They conducted executive hearings but made no statement with respect to those hearings, and imposed for all participants, even their own counsel, an oath of secrecy. The work of the Royal commission was extraordinarily effective in breaking up the spy ring and in bringing punishment to the major conspirators. Yet the civil liberties of individuals were preserved.

There are many analogies between the operations of this Royal commission and the proposed operations of a joint committee of Congress to investigate subversion in the United States. The joint committee technique has proved effective in investigations to exercise legislative oversight on the executive departments, to gather material for new legislation and to determine how existing legislation is being enforced.

The joint committee holds promise of a more effective way of accomplishing Congress' part in rooting out subversives while at the same time protecting the rights and civil liberties of the individual. It also promises greater congressional responsibility where questions involving overall foreign policy or national security, freedom of higher learning and freedom of religion are involved. It would require no new law; it could be established by resolution of both Houses of Congress. In addition to its own work, it could refer particular investigations to a standing or a special committee of either House or could recommend the establishment of a commission for the purpose and specify the conditions and rules of procedure to guide such assigned investigations, which would be under its general supervision.

President Eisenhower is reported to favor some permanent system for finding out and dealing with domestic Communists. It is possible, of course, to pass a law establishing a commission to handle all such problems. But in our country, unlike in Canada or the United Kingdom, commissions are usually temporary bodies for the purpose of making a specific report, like the (Hoover) Commission on Government Reorganization and the (Randall) Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, or proposing some plan or program, or they are administrative in nature.

It is true that there are congressional Members on the Hoover and Randall Commissions, and this suggests a possible formula for adopting the "royal commission" idea. But Congress is properly concerned about its power of legislative oversight and will not, I believe, be satisfied merely with representation on a commission engaged in this investigative field. Nor would such a commission in practice supplant congressional committees. It would seem, therefore, that if we wish to profit from our own experience and that of our Canadian neighbors in this field—and if we wish to correct present investigative excesses—the path to choose would lead to the establishment of a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate subversion and communism.

Mr. Speaker, I realize, of course, that a Joint Committee on Internal Security is not the only answer to this situation. Perhaps a code of fair play will be enough to eliminate most of our difficulties. My colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], has recently introduced such a bill, and my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr.

KEATING] introduced a similar bill some 6 years ago.

This situation is serious, as I have said, because the dignity, prestige, and effectiveness of the Congress itself are at stake. Each one of us has a basic responsibility here. More is involved than adequate rules of conduct, or even adequate machinery to enable us here in Congress to do a better job. This problem affects the reasonable and proper relationship between the legislative and executive branches of our Government. It is a problem which cannot be solved by inertia, but rather by prompt action.

UNITED STATES NEEDS AN ADEQUATE MERCHANT MARINE IN PEACE AS WELL AS IN WAR

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing myself today to the proposition that the United States needs and should have, in peace as in time of war, an adequate merchant fleet. Not only is it in the interests of national defense but it would bolster our economy by furnishing employment on ships, on the docks, in shipbuilding and repair, in ship supply and related activities. In the final analysis the Government would save millions of dollars despite the fact of subsidy requirements.

It seems incredible to me that this can still remain a matter for debate.

As a matter of fact, even the enemies of an adequate merchant fleet shy away from their own side of the argument.

They say that a merchant fleet is needed only in time of war, and that in times of peace we can forget about it.

One of the great tragedies of history is that its lessons are never learned. And the costliest lesson—costly in terms of American lives lost, American wealth destroyed, American grand strategy delayed, and wars prolonged—derives directly from the fact that we have not heeded the lesson of the great need of an adequate merchant fleet in times of peace as well as in times of war.

There are, even today, those in important and influential quarters who have yet to learn that a reasonably powerful American merchant marine is more than our first line of defense.

It is our advance line of action.

It is our guardian against the enemy before any other guardian.

It is our high seas protection against the enemy on the economic front long before our first line of military defense is called into play.

Great merchant fleets have been the making of mighty empires just as the lack of them, or their neglect, has been the undoing of whole civilizations.

History has established that fact, and repeated the proofs again and again, since the days of the ancient Phoenicians. Neglect of their merchant marine meant the loss of their prestige to ancient Greece.

The story of the great merchant fleets down through the ages is the story of the great maritime nations—the story of

prosperity, the story of enlightenment, the story of leadership and prestige.

In Spain as in England the peak of their glory coincides with the greatness of their merchant marine.

But those whose thinking runs against the evidence of history tell us today that we do not need an adequate merchant fleet, and in the event of war we can rely upon foreign merchant marines.

And I say we can depend as much on foreign merchant fleets in time of war as we can depend on foreign navies in time of war.

No nation as proud and as able as we are, with our enormous frontage on the sea, should ever permit itself to say that it will depend on foreign merchant fleets for its defense.

Such a policy is an insult to American pride and American self-reliance.

World War I was infinitely more costly because we failed at the time to have an adequate merchant fleet in being.

For the second time in a single generation history beat the facts of the indispensability of an adequate American merchant marine into our reluctant minds with frightful consequences in World War II.

Yet there are those of us in Congress who have to stand up and beg for a strong merchant fleet as if it were a form of boondoggling, or pork-barrel legislation.

The historians say our lack of a merchant fleet of any consequence was an encouragement to our enemies to make war upon us in both World Wars.

A strong merchant fleet is a lifeline for the people of the United States.

Today I want to present to you not speculative, but proved data.

For example there is no gainsaying the fact that we cannot have an adequate merchant fleet in time of war unless we have one—now—in time of peace.

To wait for the emergency to come upon us before we act against it is to build ourselves up to a state of desperation.

That is what we have been doing. Only the next time there is grave doubt that we can get away with it.

The past has proved that we need ships not only as a means of conveying supplies to our fighting men and to our allies and of bringing back materials from them, but as a means of forestalling perhaps the greatest of all wartime rack-ets.

For the absence of a sufficient merchant fleet makes us the world's outstanding sucker nation in time of war and the victim of the costliest of all rack-ets founded on the desperate national need for shipping.

We came within inches—so to speak—of losing World War I because we did not have the merchant marine the situation called for.

And then the prices we were practically blackmailed into paying for the use of foreign ships—when we could get them—to carry our desperately needed war supplies, reveals the stupidity of leaving ourselves open to this form of extortion.

The United States so neglected its merchant marine just before World War

I that our ships were carrying only 9 percent of our export and import trade. When the war finally broke and while we were still a neutral nation we were in the extremely perilous position of having no ships even for our basic needs. That made us a set-up, clay-pigeon style, for a whole variety of calamities: The nations of the world would not let us use their ships. Our country's foreign trade was paralyzed because goods and materials piled up on our docks. For instance in August 1913 we exported some 257,172 bales of cotton, but in August 1914, only a year later, this dropped to 21,219 bales. And because we did not have the ships in which to make the deliveries the price of cotton dropped from \$62.50 a bale in July 1914 to \$36.25 in December of the same year.

American businessmen caught in this dilemma faced bankruptcy.

And then the great wartime racket began.

British and neutral shipowners seized upon our high seas misery and gouged American business for all the traffic would bear—that is, those who were good enough to send any ships to our shores at all. For we were in the position at that time to be grateful even to those who were gouging us into near ruin.

Consider what happened:

Even before our traffic became heavy with munitions shipping rates went up 700 percent.

Then, when the war got going full blast shipping rates skyrocketed to 2,000 percent—a common occurrence. For general cargo the average rate jumped 1,117 percent. If there is any doubt about my figures, I refer you to the final report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 81st Congress, 2d session. This is called the Merchant Marine Study and Investigation, and was prepared by its Subcommittee on Merchant Marine Matters. The figures I have been quoting will be found on page 85.

Let us look more closely at the arithmetic:

The normal price for chartering a ship before World War I was \$1 a ton. Within 2 months after hostilities broke this \$1 price jumped to \$13.88 a ton if the destination was outside the war zone, and for destinations inside the war zone the prices went up to \$20 and \$21 a ton.

But of course you could buy the ships.

If you wanted to be stung that way the sales price was suddenly jumped from the \$60 a ton before the war to \$300 a ton when the war broke.

One voyage was enough—in many instances—to pay completely for a ship, so great had become the profits.

It is a misrepresentation of the facts to say, as some do, that American ships under foreign flags may or may not be available for our use. Most American-owned ships had been registered under foreign flag before World War I. But these ships were not made available to the United States when the war broke and Congress jumped into the breach, under the impetus of President Wilson, to remedy this situation. In August 1914 it passed a law enabling Americans to register their foreign-flag ships under

the American flag. To this law was added another one covering these ships with insurance.

The two laws made more shipping available to the United States.

With this history in front of them those who would discourage the American merchant marine still say the solution to the problem is foreign flags for American-owned ships.

The American flag by July 1, 1915, flew over 523,000 tons of shipping which had thus been transferred to it, and by 1917 this increased to a total of 650,000 tons.

When World War I ended the United States had a merchant fleet of 2,547 ships, or some 14,705,281 deadweight tons.

The cost of that fleet, the acquisition of which was imperative for the Nation's survival, is an appalling statistic that should silence the critics of an adequate merchant marine forever.

The ships that were procured by direct acquisition cost the United States \$3,042,000,000.

The Government itself constructed 2,316 of them at a cost—at wartime prices—of \$2,951,807,000.

The rest of these ships, 231 of them, were acquired by seizure of enemy property, transfer from other Government departments, or purchase at a net cost of \$126,194.

Let me give you a breakdown of that superpriced wartime merchant fleet:

Cargo	1,866
Tankers	159
Passenger	63
Transports	23
Colliers	19
Tugs, barges, and other miscellany	417
Total	2,547

The enormity of the mistake of not maintaining a peacetime fleet sufficient to our needs in foreign trade during war, distressed the wartime President Wilson who made it a point to speak out to the Nation in his third annual message to Congress in May 1915. He said:

It is high time we repaired our mistake and resumed our commercial independence on the seas. For it is a question of independence. If other nations go to war or seek to hamper each other's commerce, our merchants it seems are at their mercy, to do with as they please. We must use their ships, and use them as they determine. We have not ships enough of our own. We cannot handle our own commerce on the seas. Our independence is provincial and is only on land and within our own borders.

Out of the study and the agitation that followed World War I the 66th Congress probed the problems and the possible function in peace and in war of an American Merchant Marine. The Merchant Marine Act of 1920 emerged from an examination of the woe that had been inflicted upon the American people by a shortsighted philosophy imperiling American safety. This act was the answer of the time to the idea that we could rely upon foreign flag ships and that we did not need to maintain a merchant fleet of our own.

But suppose we let the Congress of the United States speak for itself in the language of the preamble of the Mer-

chant Marine Act of 1920. This preamble says:

That it is necessary for the national defense and for the proper growth of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine of the best equipped and most suitable types of vessels sufficient to carry the greater portion of its commerce and serve as a naval or military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, ultimately to be owned and operated privately by citizens of the United States and it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to do whatever may be necessary to develop and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine, and insofar as may not be inconsistent with the express provisions of this act, the United States Shipping Board, shall in the disposition of vessels and shipping property as hereinafter provided, in the making of rules and regulations, and in the administration of the shipping laws keep always in view this purpose and object as the primary end to be obtained.

What the Congress said in 1920 it repeated even more strongly and in greater detail and emphasis in 1936. This preamble put it this way:

It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne and a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.

But all this did not down the arguments of those who saw little point in a strong merchant fleet and who—in spite of everything—kept insisting that other nations, allied with us, had all the merchant fleets we needed, and that we could safely depend upon them.

But with the outbreak of World War II it was shown that even the Commission had underestimated the need for an American merchant fleet.

And again the country in most respects repeated the agony of World War I.

Our allies could not afford to furnish us their shipping.

The United States in the midst of war, with its enormous energies needed critically for the production of airplanes, munitions, and other war materiel, found itself confronted with the additional emergency need of a basic fleet of 5,000 ships to fill the shipping wants of our own forces and the Allied forces fighting the Axis.

But on September 1, 1939, the United States merchant fleet had only 1,379 seaworthy ships grossing 1,000 tons and over.

What had happened may very well be called the great miscalculation.

For in November 1937, the United States Maritime Commission proclaimed

that all our country needed in time of war would be 1,200 ships. This great miscalculation was predicated upon the old die-hard fallacy that the United States could safely rely on the merchant fleets of foreign nations.

It was a costly and a dreadful miscalculation.

They were wrong—and proved to be wrong—by no less than 6,234 ships.

This was one of the great mistakes of World War II.

The geography of World War II made the great miscalculation particularly onerous, for whole oceans separated us from the combat areas.

Our not having an adequate merchant marine meant that the enemy had won one of the great battles of World War II without spending a nickel or losing a single soldier.

What it cost us in lives and in treasure is incalculable.

The Axis knew the situation and exploited it.

The very inadequacy of our merchant fleet suggested the possibility to them of total victory in this phase of the war. With so little to destroy perhaps they could destroy it all.

Now what was the shipping situation the world over when World War II broke in 1939:

Well, the oceangoing merchant shipping for the world totaled some 80 million deadweight tons.

Of this 27 million were controlled by Britain and France.

The neutral shipping was mostly available to the Allies.

The German blockade was immediate with the outbreak of war. The Axis sank 16 million deadweight tons in the 27 months before we even got into the war.

And in that same 27 months all the ships that could be turned out by both the United States and the United Kingdom came to no more than 5 million deadweight tons.

This, I may add, represented practically the only new merchant shipping which the Allies could not put their hands upon.

The German submarine attack on our shipping was both spectacular and devastating. We had about 11,600,000 deadweight tons under the American flag. This included ocean passenger, dry cargo, and tanker vessels. German submarines appeared like hornets in the western Atlantic, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean. Americans standing on our eastern shores could see our submarine-struck vessels sinking off the coastline. The year of our blackest losses was 1942. That year the German submarines, sent 3,609,000 deadweight tons of American ships to the bottom of the seas. During the course of the whole war our total losses were about 6,764,000 deadweight tons. The losses for the whole period of the war to all the Allies in ships controlled or available to them was over 36 million deadweight tons. There were 733 American merchant ships of over 1,000 gross tons in these total losses by the Allies and hundreds of other American ships of lighter tonnage. What this means is

that the American loss was more than half the tonnage of our whole merchant marine before the war.

You may be interested in a breakdown of the figures showing the allied merchant shipping losses. Let me, therefore, quote them, for they give you a compact and, at the same time, a complete overall picture. Here they are:

[Deadweight tons]			
	Nontanker	Tanker	Total
September 1939–December 1941.	13,700,000	2,600,000	16,300,000
Year 1942.....	8,957,000	3,070,000	12,027,000
Year 1943.....	4,342,000	977,000	5,319,000
Year 1944.....	1,804,000	293,000	2,097,000
January–August 1945.....	679,000	160,000	839,000
Total.....	29,482,000	7,100,000	36,582,000

There were several months through 1941 and a part of 1942 when the losses of Allied shipping outbalanced all the ships that could be constructed both in the United Kingdom and the United States by more than 500,000 deadweight tons.

But luckily our shipbuilding industry had become activated in the period before we became involved in the war. This was doubly fortunate because American shipbuilding had been allowed to lag during the early thirties. Had this paralysis of the thirties continued, the effect would have compounded the shipping distress of the war, for the challenge to our shipmasters to meet the war emergency proved overwhelming. The shipbuilding capacities of Norway, the Low Countries, and France were lost to us when the German armies overran those countries. Then came the period of shipbuilding desperation. The British put in orders to American shipyards for 60 freighters in 1940. The Maritime Commission ordered 200 more cargo carriers in 1941. The American shipbuilding program widened toward the end of 1941 to build some 1,200 ships, totaling about 14 million deadweight tons.

It was at about this time that the Liberty ship was designed in the expectation that its simplified design would hasten the delivery of British orders.

The Liberty ship, however, was obsolete before the design for it had hardly been finished.

Between 1941 and 1945 American shipyards turned out a total of 5,280 ocean-going ships. They aggregated more than 54 million deadweight tons.

I have here a yearly breakdown, and I quote from my tabulations some of the more interesting figures. For instance:

Year	Number of ships	Deadweight tons
1941.....	105	1,165,200
1942.....	740	7,918,000
1943.....	1,719	18,561,400
1944.....	1,623	15,982,200
1945.....	1,093	10,597,300
Total.....	5,280	54,224,100

For those who may be interested in the breakdown of the types of ships, and

the tonnage, I have here these estimates. They show that:

	Number of ships	Deadweight tons
Standard cargo.....	475	4,694,400
Liberty ships.....	2,708	29,182,400
Victory ships.....	414	4,491,700
Tankers.....	678	10,934,200
Military troop ships.....	245	1,243,700
Other military types.....	266	1,791,700
Miscellaneous.....	494	1,886,000
Total.....	5,280	54,224,100

Now it will be interesting to see how the argument stands up which the so-called experts advanced that we could depend on foreign nations for our merchant fleet in time of war.

Let us see what they contributed in the way of ships while the German submarines and the Japanese were playing havoc with allied shipping on the high seas:

Well, the British Empire shipyards during the war delivered less than 11 million deadweight tons.

All of our allies together furnished us with about 715,000 gross tons of ships.

Against that we delivered to them 5,500,000 gross tons.

The costs were exorbitant in both life and treasure and the desperation was extreme but the United States Merchant Marine delivered the material to the men at the front and to our fighting allies.

Between December 7, 1941, and the surrender of Japan the total cargo lift from the United States outward bound was: 268,252,000 long tons.

Of this, 203,522,000 represented dry cargo and 64,730,000 constituted petroleum and other liquid freight. This meant the delivery at an average of 8,500 tons of cargo every hour of every day and every night during the last year of the war.

It was American ships also that carried overseas the bulk of the 7,129,907 Army personnel and the 141,537 civilians between December 7, 1941, and November 30, 1945.

This was an achievement in the face of the experts and the theorists who argued for a small and inadequate merchant fleet.

It was an achievement which made it possible for us to carry the burden of the shipping load of the free world.

But the shortsightedness that compelled the extra and over-extra effort that went into our sudden and desperate shipbuilding project ate up a vast portion of our war energy and our war construction materials in the hour of crisis.

Our capacity to build made possible our capacity to deliver.

Another effect was to frustrate the awful gouging which made us the No. 1 sucker nation, in maritime matters in World War I.

The general cargo rates in World War II increased 70 percent. In World War I they had gone up 1,117 percent.

What makes the difference even more remarkable is that the costs of operating ships in World War II were far greater than they had been in World War I.

Now, I want to focus your attention on a single piece of oceangoing arithmetic

to show what it would mean to the United States if it had its own ships to transport its troops, instead of buying up passenger space for our fighting men on the ships of our allies.

The British *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth* were two ships among others on which our troops were rushed to Europe and on which they afterward came home. In the interests of economy, maximum results, and the effort to meet the emergency, anywhere from 10,000 to 15,000 American troops were jammed on each of these great liners for every voyage across the ocean. But a price had to be paid—for every soldier on board ship.

Our British ally charged the Government of the United States at the rate of £20 per soldier. This came to about \$1 million gross for a one-way trip. In the course of the war the *Queen Elizabeth* carried 364,178 American troops from the United States to Europe and 104,368 from Europe to the United States. The *Queen Mary* transported 353,939 to Europe and 155,716 back—all United States troops. Thus the two *Queens* transported a total of 978,201 American troops.

Now my point is that at the rates I have just quoted from the records, it would not have been long before the United States could have paid the construction subsidy for an American passenger liner.

Let us put it in figures:

The direct construction subsidy for the new and magnificent United States passenger liner, the steamship *United States*, is \$18 million.

The features on the ship, especially installed for her quick conversion to a troop carrier in the event of war, cost the Government of the United States \$32 million.

It is clear, it seems to me, that this is an excellent investment.

For here is an American-flag passenger ship which can transport 14,000 troops 10,000 miles at the world record speed of more than 35 knots without refueling.

It is a ship which is always in our control. It can do a bigger job better. And we will not be paying our money to another country for the use of its ships to carry our troops, subject to their conditions.

The American merchant marine for its work in World War II deserves the highest tribute. The man best qualified to give it was Fleet Adm. Ernest King, then in charge of United States naval operations, during the period in question. He wrote Admiral Land on November 2, 1945, like this:

During the past 3½ years, the Navy has been dependent upon the merchant marine to supply our farflung fleet and bases. Without this support, the Navy could not have accomplished its mission. Consequently, it is fitting that the merchant marine share in our success as it shared in our trials.

The merchant marine is a strong bulwark of national defense in peace and war, and a buttress to sound national economy. A large merchant marine is not only an important national resource; it is, in being, an integral part of our country's armed

might during time of crisis. During World War II this precept has been proven.

As the merchant marine returns to its peacetime pursuits, I take pleasure in expressing the Navy's heartfelt thanks to you and through you to the officers and men of the merchant marine for their magnificent support during World War II. All hands can feel a pride of accomplishment in a job well done.

We wish the merchant marine every success during the years ahead and sincerely hope that it remains strong and continues as a vital and integral part of our national economy and defense.

But even the history of facts, the very living example of contemporaneous events, plus the carefully expressed convictions of Admiral King, failed to persuade those who continued to argue that our merchant marine needed no modernization and that its neglect was of no concern to our country. The admiral says our merchant fleet should remain strong and that it is necessary to our national economy and our defense. I repeat the definitive line from the admiral's letter to his colleague that a large merchant marine "is not only an important national resource; it is, in being, an integral part of our country's armed might during the time of crisis." No one can say it more plainly, more bluntly, or more authoritatively than that.

It seems hard to believe that there are those even now who insist that our merchant marine should be scrapped by neglect to help close the dollar gap between the United States and other powers. And again, up comes the wearisome, defeated, fallacious, and, I believe, dangerous argument, that we can depend in wartime on foreign merchant fleets and American-owned ships under foreign flag. They are saying this in spite of the evidence that during the comparatively limited war in Korea our allies were in no position to furnish the ships for the needed tasks of that emergency.

The record, as far as I have it almost up to the end of the armistice, shows that it was our merchant ships which delivered 80 percent of the cargoes to Korea.

Only modernization and efficient maintenance can bring our merchant fleet to a status to meet an all-out war. And it is our merchant fleet alone which we can depend upon in the event of so great an emergency.

There is no question today but that in the next war we will be required to build all their ships for our allies. For there is no change in the basic situation that prevailed in both world wars. We went into them without one fundamental requirement for our economic and military defense—a merchant fleet. We paid a frightful price. In the face of this twice demonstrated mistake are we now deliberately to go through it again for the third time?

Rear Adm. R. E. Wilson stated the position of the Department of Defense on June 16, 1953, before the Special Subcommittee on Maritime Subsidies. This written statement again expresses the need and the importance of enlarging and modernizing our United States merchant fleet and shipbuilding facilities. He, too, would place maximum reliance

on United States flag shipping and not on foreign ships, or American ships under foreign flags.

Now I would like to present a correct picture of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. To begin with, the act did away with the undesirable, indirect ship operating subsidy. This indirect subsidy used to be camouflaged as a form of compensation for carrying mail. The act was more forthright. It simply created a subsidy for the construction of ships in United States shipyards and for the operation of certain American ships in the regular berth services. It was what it said it was. What needs to be pointed out is that the operating subsidy does not guarantee profits to a shipping company. The subsidy establishes parity between the builders and operators of United States ships and their foreign competitors who operate their ships in countries with a very low standard of living.

Along with not guaranteeing a profit I think I ought to emphasize the recapture section in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to correct another false impression. The recapture section provides that one-half of all profits in excess of capital used in the business over a 10-year period are recaptured up to the amount of the subsidy paid. There is no other Government subsidy program in which such a provision appears.

Now what effect has this subsidy section actually had in recapturing subsidies?

Well, 4 out of the 12 recipient companies who got subsidies during the first 10 years of the law's operation returned to the Government all of the operating subsidy money that had been advanced to them. The other eight companies returned a substantial portion of the subsidy. The total paid out in operating subsidies for the first 10 years ending December 31, 1948, was \$88 million. Of this \$88 million, the Government recaptured \$52,500,000. The companies retained \$35,515,800. Subsidies were suspended during the war years from April 1942 to December 1946. So that the Government's cost of operating subsidy was about \$6 million a year.

That is a \$6 million a year subsidy for a merchant marine.

Contrast that with the subsidies provided by the Government during the same 10 years to other industries:

The dairy industry got a Government subsidy of \$1,205,645,000.

The sugar industry got a Government subsidy of \$524,195,000.

A Government subsidy of \$132,694,000 went for potatoes.

A Government subsidy of \$67,635,000 went for cheddar cheese.

All agriculture subsidies together came to \$2,104,192,000.

Agriculture got additional help through the tariff which the Government imposed by charging and collecting \$2,700,741,000 during the 10-year period.

Figures like that make the \$35,515,800 in operating subsidies paid to the American merchant marine seem puny indeed.

Nor is what I have just said to be interpreted as a criticism of farm subsidies.

I am merely presenting the audit so that the importance of a merchant-marine parity can be appreciated.

Today the fact is clear that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 demands an adequate merchant marine to carry a substantial portion of our domestic and foreign trade and to serve for our country's defense, and that, as of now, the Government has failed to provide a sufficient subsidy to carry out the mandate of the Congress.

That is the story.

The figures are dramatic and compelling because our World War I ship-building program cost \$2,951,807,000. These ships would have cost about \$840 million had they been built before the war. But the difference in cost was not all the consequences of the mistake of neglect. The ships built during the war proved inefficient. And not only were they not available when they were needed, but many of them never saw war service at all.

To put it another way it has been estimated that a fleet of, say, 8 million deadweight tons, sufficient for World War I, would, prior to the war, have cost at the most \$500 million. This means that a sound maritime policy would have given us a saving of \$2,500,000,000 in ship construction, exclusive of all other advantages. All of which adds up to this:

The desperate, almost hysterical ship-building energies could have been used in other areas of the war effort.

There would have been no rate-gouging at our expense.

The men and the supplies would have reached their destinations on time as the military required them.

The war would have been shortened. Lives would have been saved.

During the first decade of the 1936 act the operating differential per year was about \$30,000 per ship. That means that we could have run a fleet of 1,000 competent ships for 20 years prior to World War I and been ahead \$2 billion if we were to include the possible savings in the cost of construction. And that construction cost is certainly a valid item and a realistic one.

How about the story for World War II?

Well, the United States built 54,224,100 deadweight tons of merchant shipping during this war, costing \$14,204,000,000.

With a cost of only \$4 billion, a 40-million-deadweight-ton fleet could have been built having the same cargo capacity, had the construction been done before war broke out.

That would have meant a saving of \$10,204,000,000.

Given that amount we could have had 2,000 modern ships at the outbreak of the war, and still have saved \$8 or \$9 billion to say nothing of critical materials, time, and life.

On a saving like that under present-day high operating differentials we could keep a fleet of 2,000 vessels trafficking on the high seas for more than a quarter of a century.

Now that I am approaching the end of my talk let me make it clear that

those of us who favor an adequate American merchant marine do not hold that we can at all times support an active peacetime merchant fleet, backed up by ships in reserve, in a quantity to meet our needs and the needs of our allies in time of war. In the light of our World War II experience it has been figured out that the United States will need at least 6,000 modern ships for an all-out world war III.

Now the question is how large should our merchant fleet be? The best judgment is that it should be large enough—composed of modern ships—to be able to carry at least 50 percent of our export and import trade. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in its preamble said that our merchant marine must be—I quote—"sufficient to carry a substantial portion of our foreign trade." That was its greatest error, the term "substantial portion." When we say "sufficient to carry at least 50 percent of our export and import trade" we give meaning to our language. But "substantial" can mean as many things as there are points of view.

It is our contention that Congress intended our merchant marine to carry at least 50 percent of our incoming and outgoing trade. But it is not to be assumed from this that on some trade routes we should not carry less than 50 percent, or more on other trade routes. For confirmation on what I have just said I point to the congressional mandates that American ships should carry at least 50 percent of the cargoes provided under our foreign economic and military aid program. You will find the 50 percent provision in these programs:

First. Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and the ECA Amendments, 1949, Public Law 47, 81st Congress.

Second. Korean Aid Act, Public Law 447, 81st Congress.

Third. Yugoslavia Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950, Public Law 897, 81st Congress.

Fourth. India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951, Public Law 48, 82d Congress.

Fifth. Mutual Defense Assistance Act, Public Law 329, 81st Congress.

Sixth. Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, 82d Congress.

Seventh. Pakistan wheat bill, public law 77, 83d Congress.

The 73d Congress in Public Resolution 17, declared that all cargoes financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or by any other agency of Government, should be transported in American ships when these are available at reasonable prices. But this was cut down to 50 percent by Government agencies in consultation with shipping interests. A desirable effect of this administrative practice has been to provide a weapon against discriminatory shipping practices pursued to our disadvantage by other maritime nations.

An American merchant fleet capable of carrying at least 50 percent of our foreign trade is the most reasonable figure because it represents a workable nucleus for expansion in the event of another all-out war. The 50-percent estimate is based on a fluctuating volume of foreign trade in a period of national emergency. We know that as the na-

tional emergency rises the sea traffic rises proportionately to meet the mounting movement of supplies and troops. Then as this traffic mounts we should increase our merchant fleet. Such a result is possible if our ships now are called on to carry at least 50 percent of our export and import trade.

But what is the figure now?

American-flag ships in January of 1953 carried only 25.8 percent of our foreign trade. It is my understanding that the average figure is about 30 percent.

That means we have cut the needed program in half.

We are repeating, after all the agony, the same mistake we made in World War I and World War II.

Our merchant marine is being subjected to neglect by the same purblind thinking that cost us untold lives and billions in dollars in World Wars I and II.

Twice we have been a voice crying in the wilderness.

There may not be an opportunity for a third time—for the third time our Nation may not survive the ordeal.

Our program is clear, it is definite, it has historical proof and statistical evidence.

Let us, united, make sure that we have an adequate merchant marine, in peacetime as well as in time of war.

"I DO NOT BELIEVE THE MATERIAL YOU HAVE SUGGESTED WOULD BE USEFUL"—AN OUTRAGEOUS REFUSAL BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO FURNISH INFORMATION OF A NONCONFIDENTIAL NATURE TO A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of Congress since January 1937. In the intervening 17 years, I had always found the executive agencies of the Government conscious of the fact that Members of Congress were entitled to certain types of information without question. I am speaking, of course, of technical information which they are capable of developing and which in no way involves anything of a secret or confidential nature. I had never had the experience of having an executive department, or an official of any agency, refuse to provide me with certain information because he thought the material I requested would not be useful. In other words, that he did not think the conclusions which might be drawn from such information would be useful—not to me or to the Congress—but to the agency itself.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is always a first time for everything. I was told by the head of one of the Government departments that he would not provide me with some technical information for the reason that he did not believe the material I have asked for would be useful.

There is no question of the ability of his agency to provide this information. He just did not think I should have it.

The gentleman who took this position is the Secretary of the Treasury. And what he said, in effect, was this—I am, of course, paraphrasing: "There has been given to the House Ways and Means Committee certain projections on estimated revenue losses over the next 3 years resulting from a change the Treasury has recommended in methods of computing depreciation allowances for tax purposes. When you ask me to use exactly the same premises and project this information over a 10-year period rather than just 3 years, you are asking for information I do not think is very good information to have kicking around Congress. It might be misunderstood. Therefore, I do not think it would be useful to give it to you. Therefore, go soak your head—I am not going to give this information to you."

Mr. Humphrey used somewhat more polite language than that. He did not tell me to go soak my head. He did not come right out and say he would not like to see information of this kind in the hands of the Congress. He did not say flatly he would not give it to me.

Here is what he did say:

We believe that any long-term statistical projections based upon any assumed rate of capital investment would be unrealistic. Therefore, I do not believe the material you have suggested would be useful.

And, of course, I did not get the information.

Mr. Speaker, I rise here on the House floor to bring this matter to the attention of the Congress not out of any sense of personal pique over the Secretary's rudeness. I think he has been impertinent, offensive, obnoxious in this matter. He has been deliberately insolent and insulting. And I resent it.

I resent it, Mr. Speaker, not for myself—because I have seen other instances on the part of this Secretary of the Treasury which reflects arrogance toward individuals with whom he disagrees. But I deeply resent, and cannot so readily pass over, the insult here to the Congress itself—to the institution we Members cherish and do our best to serve.

The Secretary of the Treasury certainly has the right to disagree with any Member of Congress, or, for that matter, with every Member of Congress, over any legislative proposal he chooses. He can argue with us in the Ways and Means Committee on any tax matter, and he can tell us we are wrong when he thinks we are wrong. That is his right and, in fact, his duty. None of us on the Ways and Means Committee has ever objected to any Secretary of the Treasury telling us in the most forceful language at his command that a certain proposed change in the tax laws or in any other law is good or bad for the country. He can not only disagree with us; as a presidential appointee, he can go out and campaign against us and we have no objection to that.

But when this Secretary of the Treasury or any Secretary of the Treasury attempts to tell us on the Ways and Means Committee that he will not give us technical information which he possesses—information which merely carries forward projections and estimates

he has already volunteered to the committee—because in his opinion it would not serve a useful purpose for us to have that material, then I say he has overstepped the bounds of decency and propriety, he has told the Congress to do no independent thinking on its own but to take his estimates and his suggestions and proposals as the final say—as a sacred ukase which brooks no doubt or independent investigation.

Let me explain, Mr. Speaker, why I am so exercised about this incident. For many long and weary weeks, as you know and as the Members know, the Ways and Means Committee has been going over the whole complex and complicated structure of our internal revenue code to write an entirely new tax law—the first real thoroughgoing revision in the tax laws in many, many years. It is exhausting work.

Any taxpayer whoever struggled with a Form 1040 or a corporate tax form as March 15 approached knows that the subject is infernally intricate. Tax lawyers devote their lives to learning the ins-and-outs of the tax laws, to understand them. The Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation have both put to work over a period of several years their best technical brains on the subject to draft the proposals submitted before our committee. And now these proposals are before us for decision.

On every decision we make, millions if not billions of dollars are involved—not just for the Government but for businesses and for individuals. The future of a plant or industry in your district may rest on an innocuous-sounding phrase inserted in this bill. It could perhaps kill that plant or industry, wreck it. Or it could bring millions of additional profits to General Motors or the Hanna Coal Co. or any other large undertaking.

We on the committee are mortals, subject to human error. But I should like to make clear that every member of that committee is conscientiously trying to do a fair and honest job in writing this legislative monster, which is what a tax bill inevitably has to be.

When that bill comes here on the House floor we want to know what is in it and be able to explain it to your satisfaction. We do not want to have jokers slipped into it without our knowledge. We do not want to be misled into an extravagant handout of the taxpayer's dollar or of the Nation's revenues to this or that particular group of individuals or to this or that particular group of businesses.

The bill as it now stands is a big-business bill which provides many new means under which corporations and stockholders in corporations can ease their tax responsibilities at the expense of the rest of the citizens of this Nation. So far, there is practically nothing in this bill which eases the tax of the wage earner or the small-business man. It is a rich man's, an investor's tax bill.

The members of the committee who have supported some of these provisions to which I and other minority members object, and who have opposed the kind of tax relief we on the Democratic side

have proposed for the little fellow—for the wage earner, for the general public, for the great mass of people who pay the taxes we spend for defense and other purposes—the Members on the majority side, I repeat, have put these provisions into the bill because they believe they are good for the country. They believe in the trickle-down theory of economic prosperity—make business happy, give it all kinds of tax incentives to expand, make common stocks more attractive to investors, and prosperity will be assured. That is their belief. They believe in it sincerely. We on the Democratic side are just as sincere and honest in believing that if the great mass of the people have money to spend on the things they want and need, business will provide those needs and make such profits as will guarantee an expanding economy and a prosperous economy.

Those two divergent views, Mr. Speaker, probably go further to explain the philosophic differences of the two major political parties in the United States today than any other set of premises. The issue of slavery once provided this contrast. Then, later, it was tariffs. In 1932 it was the role of the Federal Government in moving against misery and suffering and starvation. Later, with some exceptions on both sides, it was the issue of foreign policy—in the historic debates before Pearl Harbor. Today it is this question of how to assure prosperity—how to restore it first, for it temporarily seems to have fled from us, and then how to maintain it and expand it.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that in arguing out these issues in a straightforward, honest, and sincere fashion, we are upholding the greatest traditions of American democracy. We are doing our duty as Members of Congress or as officials of Government. In our deliberations, we are, if you will excuse an overworked phrase now almost synonymous with a popular television program, only after the facts. We can disagree over what the facts portend, but we feel we should and must have all the facts available to us, no matter what they show.

In the case of this one technical matter involving depreciation, I have been disturbed that the proposal supported by a majority of the committee will mean an extravagant handout of tax revenues to a few big corporations—to them it could be worth many millions of dollars a year. That may or may not mean it is bad for the country. We can have separate views on that.

But the Secretary of the Treasury has seen fit to tell us what it will mean, according to certain estimates and projections he has made covering the first 3 years of its application. He told us it would mean a reduction in revenue for the third year of \$1,550,000,000.

In writing to the Secretary about this matter, I did not accuse him of any wrongdoing. I did not make any insinuations about him—his patriotism or his friendships or his golf score. I made no effort to argue the merits of this depreciation change.

I asked only for a further projection of his own estimates—for 10 years instead of for 3. I asked him to disregard

any incentive factor, and to use exactly the same assumptions in the 10-year projection as he had in the 3-year projection in regard to levels of business activity, levels of business investment, and levels of tax rates.

And that was all.

I noted that it was particularly important for me to have the answer by February 25, and I am pleased to say that in writing his answer by February 26 he got it to me only a day after I had considered it important to receive the information requested in my letter of February 20.

I subsequently found that there was no reason for him to spend 6 days preparing his answer, for it gave me none of the facts I requested.

His letter—unanimous-consent request—is in sharp contrast with the one I sent him. Instead of giving me the objective factual information I requested, he gave me a page of arguments as to why the Treasury proposal on depreciation was a good thing, why it would not cost the Government any money at all in the long run—a highly debatable point—and why and how it would encourage capital expansion and bring more risk capital into play in the economy.

I did not ask him for any of that information—he had already told us that several times, like a school teacher in the elementary grades dinning the multiplication table into the dense skulls of reluctant pupils.

But he would not give the extended projections I requested, because he had decided they would not be useful.

A proper answer, it seems to me, would be to give me the extended projections I had requested, while at the same time disputing their reliability. If I attempted to use them in any improper way, he could have objected. If I had drawn conclusions from them with which he disagreed, he could have disputed them. If I had sought to use the projections without acknowledging the Secretary's doubts as to their validity, he could have demanded on behalf of fair play that the doubts be cited and he could have cited them himself.

In short, he and the Treasury and the administration have various protections against any improper or unfair use of the Treasury's figures to oppose the Treasury's point of view.

But he did not choose to rest on these protections. He has insulted me as an individual and as a Member by deciding in his superior wisdom it would not be a safe thing for me to have this information and therefore he has refused to provide it.

I say in all candor, Mr. Speaker, that this is a new approach by an executive agency to the proper sphere of Congress. I say it is an insult to the entire House and to the entire Congress. I say it is scandalous misuse of executive power and a warning to the Congress to defend its prerogatives before new and deeper encroachments are undertaken by this arrogant official, newly arrived from big business, who administers the Treasury Department of the United States.

Whether the information I requested is useful or not, I insist it must be forth-

coming. I insist upon it in behalf of the rights of all Members to courteous treatment and factual accounting from the executive departments.

I have therefore renewed my request to the Secretary of the Treasury to provide the information.

FEBRUARY 26, 1954.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your letter of February 26 in response to my request of the 20th for certain information.

I am frankly astonished by your failure to provide the information I requested on the grounds that you "do not believe the material (I) have suggested would be useful." I can only conclude that you have not read my letter of February 20 with sufficient care.

If you do so, you will note that I made a specific request for specific information. I did not ask for your opinion as to whether or not this information would be useful, although had you complied with my request I would have been most happy to have your opinion and would have given it careful consideration.

Although my letter specifically requested you not to take into account any so-called incentive factor—that is, increased investment arising out of this new depreciation method—I was surprised that the bulk of your response dealt with what you believe will be the increase in business investment resulting from incentives of this new depreciation method.

Economists know that, important as it may be, this incentive factor is so vague and nebulous that it cannot be accurately calculated. That is why the first 3 years' projections made by your Department and by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation were careful to exclude that factor. That is also why I am again requesting that you not take this factor into account and that you not use this vague concept as an excuse for failing to continue the projections already begun by your Department and the joint committee staff.

Inasmuch as your Department and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation have made these computations for the first 3 years, there is no reason why similar computations cannot be made for succeeding years, using the same assumptions as to level of economic activity and levels of investment and taxation. It is not for you to judge whether these computations would be useful to me or not. One of the duties of your Department is to furnish information requested by the Congress and Congress will decide whether or not the information is useful. If your staff is unable to make these computations, I suggest they contact the staff of the joint committee which made the 3-year projection.

As you know, the Revenue Act of 1954 will soon be finally acted upon by the Committee on Ways and Means and will shortly thereafter be considered by the House of Representatives. I feel that the information I am requesting is essential to my own deliberations on this bill, and I must insist that you furnish this information to me by noon on Wednesday, March 3. If you do not intend to furnish the information by that time I should like to have word from you to that effect by noon on Monday, March 1.

In my 18 years in Congress your response to my request represents the first time a Secretary of the Treasury has failed to furnish to a Member of Congress who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means information concerning a pending tax measure.

I note that you oppose an increase in the personal exemptions—which will benefit the average taxpayer—because of the revenue loss involved. I cannot reconcile this with your failure to furnish a Member of Congress with information on the revenue loss from a

provision whose benefits will go to the corporations of the country, on the ground that the information would not be useful.

I am at a loss to understand why you should not disclose the revenue effects of such provision, unless you fear that to do so would disclose the true nature of this tax bill—one which ignores the average taxpayer and gives enormous benefits to corporations and high-income taxpayers.

Knowing your regard for the fiscal stability of the Nation, I am sure that you will not decline again to furnish to a Member of Congress, especially one who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, information which is crucial to the future of our Nation's economy.

Sincerely,

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 26, 1954.

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EBERHARTER: I have your letter of February 20 requesting estimates of the effects on the revenue of double-rate declining-balance depreciation for the fiscal years 1957 to 1964, under certain stated assumptions.

As you know, the change in the tax treatment of depreciation will simply change the timing of depreciation deductions, and not the total deductions. Over the entire period of use of a machine or building, its total cost will be written off under any system of depreciation accounting. With any given amount of investment, there would be no net change in total revenue, except insofar as tax rates may change.

Looking at a single item, revenues would be lower in the early years than under the present system. But a point is reached, depending on the life of the asset, after which revenues will be higher than at present. Any increase in deductions during the early years will, of course, be offset by decreased deductions in later years.

My own experience and the advice of numerous groups convince me that faster depreciation in the early years of use will very substantially increase total investment over what it would be under straight-line depreciation. This will occur because the opportunity for an earlier recovery of capital will encourage people to take the risks which exist in any capital investment. The change will also increase investment by making possible shorter term financing which is especially important for small and growing companies.

Because of the combination of the two factors noted above, we believe that any long term statistical projections based upon any assumed rate of capital investment would be unrealistic. Therefore, I do not believe the material you have suggested would be useful. We feel sure that the net effect of the change in depreciation accounting will be to increase revenues, as well as employment and national income, because of the stimulation to investment.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

FEBRUARY 20, 1954.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I note that you have projected the net revenue reduction resulting from the double-rate declining-balance depreciation provisions adopted by the House Ways and Means Committee for the first 3 years of its operation, giving a

total reduction in revenues for the third year of \$1,550,000,000.

I assume that there will continue to be a net revenue reduction from this provision (as compared with the revenues that would result from continuing the present straight-line methods) for some years to come.

I am writing to request you to project these estimated net revenue reductions for an additional 7 years (making a total of 10 years from the date on which this declining balance method will take effect). In projecting these please use the same assumptions as to (a) level of economic activity, (b) level of business investment, and (c) tax rates that were used in arriving at the 3-year projection already completed and do not take into account any incentive factor.

It is quite important that I have this information by Thursday, February 25.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I noticed in the newspapers of Monday that Secretary Humphrey participated in a television program on Sunday, which he had a perfect right to do, and that when he was asked about the proposal of the Democratic members on the Ways and Means Committee, which motion was offered in the committee to increase personal exemptions from \$600 to \$700 per person, he termed it as "political propaganda." Did the gentleman see that in the newspaper?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am sorry, I did not see it, but I am not surprised to hear that was his reaction to a proposal made by the Democrats.

Mr. McCORMACK. You can disagree with the judgment of a person, but when you go beyond that you are entering dangerous territory when you impugn the motives of an entire political party.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I doubt whether any Secretary of the Treasury has ever attributed to proposals made by the other side purely political motives.

Mr. McCORMACK. I served on the Ways and Means Committee for 10 years myself before being elected majority leader, and I agree with the gentleman. I have no recollection that any such characterization, which goes to the motives not only of members but representatives of a political party on a committee, particularly the great Committee on Ways and Means. I think the Secretary has a lot to learn. He should be very careful in making statements that impugn the motives of an individual member, but he should be particularly careful when he impugns the motives of all members of the Democratic Party, as he did in this case in connection with the Ways and Means Committee, when he characterized a proposal, sincerely offered, as "political propaganda."

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it would be well to see the results that occur in the House if we have an opportunity to have a vote of the membership on the question of whether an increase in exemptions is purely political or whether the membership decides it is proper relief. I would say in my judgment the majority of the people of this country would say that they certainly favor an

exemption increase. We have come to a pretty pass, Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary of the Treasury, on whom all Members of Congress would like to rely as responsible, who feel that he has an important position and should be respected for his judgment, and perhaps consider them very much in the light of the position he holds as having special opportunities to render valuable advice. But when he characterizes a political party of the opposition, the Democratic Party, with being entirely advocates of something for purely a political nature, when it comes to taxes, I think he is showing a disdain that ill behooves a man holding such a position as he holds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PROSPERITY AND DEFENSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the present administration took office in January of 1953, I made a speech in my district in which I touched upon some of the basic and grave problems facing the country and the new Government. At that time I stated in effect that the new President elected by a substantial majority of the American people was entitled to an opportunity to work out his program and that in that process every American regardless of party should strive to cooperate in order to solve some of the great issues before us.

What I deem to be far more pertinent at present, however, was that I then expressed the hope and also urged at that time that, notwithstanding any other factors, the leaders of the new administration would pursue forward-looking policies with respect to the national economy, the full-time employment of our people and the security and well-being of workers, farmers, small-business men, and others who make up our great composite American body politic.

I especially expressed the hope that the new administration and its leadership would not pursue any policy which would have the effect of unloosing recessionary forces in the economy, thus causing diminished business activity, unemployment, and concern about our future stability. That was early in 1953.

I do not desire at this time to enlarge upon the policies which have since been followed by the administration because in general they are well known to the Members of this body and to the people. Contrary to my expectations and hopes, recessionary policies have been pursued with economic and social consequences which are now very apparent and which have been felt in many communities

throughout the land in the form of reduced business activity and unemployment.

In a short period of time, haphazard and ill-considered attacks have been made upon many great pending problems. The armed services have been indiscriminately slashed and that is a matter which is giving greatest concern to those of us who have been working to maintain a strong defense and powerful striking power in our Armed Forces, as well as to the general public and our allies.

Undoubtedly this move has also given our potential enemies to believe that we are indulging ourselves in a somewhat luxurious complacency about the general, very dangerous, unsettled world picture.

On the domestic front, poorly conceived, restrictive monetary policies have been adopted, the farm-price-support program has been radically manipulated, thus suddenly diminishing the purchasing power of a very large segment of our people, indiscriminate layoffs of Government workers have been effected, resulting in many individual cases of injustice to long-time faithful employees and also adding to the generally recessionary influences of other policies. Hasty, unsound economies and cuts have been made in the budget. I do not have the exact figures, but many billions of dollars will have been cut across the board from the national budget for the ensuing fiscal year.

In the light of these developments it is not difficult to understand why the delicate psychological balance of public sentiment and confidence which so vitally influences the American economy and which frequently marks out the boundaries between prosperity and recession, has been considerably disturbed. Nor it is difficult to realize why so many business concerns, individuals, and families at every level comprising the purchasing power which makes the economy click have commenced to restrict their purchasing, or cut down their business activity, to accord with their view of possible future adverse economic trends. One who calmly surveys these conditions cannot but have genuine concern. Obviously the lifting of so many billions of dollars in terms of Government expenditure from the economy in such a short period of time of itself would be bound to have very significant repercussions, not only in the psychology, but in the actual business and working lives of our citizens. That is surely an economic fact of which we can all take note.

While all these things are happening the commodity markets are upset and the security market is reflecting the idea, apparently widely held by investors and marketing experts, that these conditions may be moving the Nation in time toward greater inflation. That is one of the paradoxes in the situation.

I am most sympathetic concerning the problems confronting the administration which are of such great moment to all of us, and no one is more anxious than I am to cooperate in working them out on a sound realistic basis. But we cannot afford to let these matters drift any longer. Some affirmative action must be

taken and taken promptly. The national leadership must find ways and means of restoring the confidence of businessmen and the general public. The administration and the Congress must be prepared to inaugurate now policies which will not only stop, but counteract, the recessionary forces presently operating in the economy which are looming more and more day by day as a real danger to the national prosperity, to economic stability, and moving toward a weakening of our productive strength and national morale, so important and vital to us at this time of crisis to meet the manifestations and threats of world communism.

I do not favor haphazard policies in government at any time, and I am not suggesting unsound remedies based solely on Federal spending or novel, untried, economic experiments. I should like to see these very important questions tackled at once both by the administration and the Congress and carefully surveyed and studied and a definite program adopted which can secure widest possible support in the Congress and among the people, which will move toward the essential ends of halting recession and again assuring prosperous business conditions and the employment of all our citizens.

Some of these proposed remedial measures undoubtedly lie in the monetary field and should be tackled immediately by financial experts and appropriate committees of our Congress under the leadership of the very able specialists in financial matters who are Members of our respective bodies. Other measures clearly lie in the tax field where it certainly should be possible for the Congress in view of current conditions to lower the taxes, direct and indirect, including excise and nuisance taxes, upon various classes of the American people, and particularly our workers and members of the rank and file, and thereby stimulate some renewed purchasing power.

I believe also that the Congress should give early consideration to the extremely complex agricultural price-support system with a view to ameliorating the depressed conditions which are beginning to appear among many of our farmers. At the same time we should give our attention also to the general extension, rather than the limitation, of the resources and instrumentalities of this great economy of ours so as to make it what it should be—not a contracting economy, but a vital, dynamic, expanding economy predicated upon the full-est possible development of our national resources, human and material, and by all means under every circumstance the full-time employment of our citizens.

Included also in these considerations should be the immediate activation, if it appears necessary, of the huge program of public works and public development which we have been assured by administration leaders has been blueprinted and is ready to be put into operation. We should have in mind that it will take considerable time to implement and make this program really effective.

And most important of all in my opinion, in the interest and the safety and

security of the Nation and without boondoggling, waste, or inefficiency, the Congress should promptly move to restore most of the cuts that have been indiscriminately made in national defense so that imbalances between the various services will be eliminated, and so that we may have an appropriately balanced, soundly devised, adequately established armed services truly sufficient to meet any and every contingency that may arise. The national security comes first. It should never be risked for ill-timed economy.

We must never permit men who, despite great ability, have extremely limited experience in dealing with the special technical and generalized problems of world policy in relation to national defense, and who have had little or no practice in handling delicate public questions and problems, to dictate a course of action for this Congress which may save tax dollars for the corporate and privileged classes of the Nation, but which in the end may leave this country inadequately prepared for possible aggression, inadequately equipped to cope with attacks upon our security, and inadequately implemented to deliver smashing and devastating blows against a sudden adversary.

I urge the administration leaders and our own committees to take immediate action to cope with these great problems because if the current situation is permitted to drift further we may land on the shoals of sudden economic lassitude which could not only gravely imperil our economy but might very well invite assaults upon the national security as well.

LEGISLATIVE TASKS AHEAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a high honor and privilege to represent the people of the 19th Congressional District in the great State of California. Their confidence in me is shown by the fact that they elected me to this congressional office in 1942 and have kept me here ever since.

While my political views are well known and frankly stated, I have tried always to serve the people in a fair manner and to avoid a narrow, partisan approach. I believe the voters of my district respect and appreciate that concept of congressional service, because Democrats and Republicans alike have nominated me for office.

It is my purpose now to present a report to the people of the 19th Congressional District of California outlining major legislative tasks ahead, as I see them.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The social security system created under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt and now in existence for almost 20 years, must be expanded and improved. Our citizens are entitled to assurance that they will have a secure and steady income in retirement and old age.

Various perfecting amendments to the Social Security Act are needed to bring

more persons under the benefits of the act, to increase the amount of the benefits received by individuals, to allow retired persons to do useful work and earn some money without being penalized in regard to social security payments, to enlarge the amount of base earnings that can be credited for such payments, to allow the computation of benefits on a fairer basis by excluding periods of abnormally low earnings, and to protect the benefit rights of those who become disabled.

Improvements in the social security system along these lines have been recommended by the President and will receive my full support. However, I am greatly disturbed by the fact that some members of the President's own party in the Congress are challenging the basic worth of the social security system. They want to tamper with the trust fund—over \$19 billion—that has been built up over the years by the individual contributions of workers and employers. They are advocating drastic changes in the system which would destroy the equities our people now have in the system and which would, in my judgment, result in a lowering of benefits to all.

I shall fight any moves to weaken or destroy social security in America. It is my hope that Members of Congress, regardless of party, will come together in a spirit of good will and vote the necessary improvements in the social security law. I regard this legislative action as a must.

MORE JOBS

Today our people are greatly concerned about growing unemployment and the difficulties faced by small business. Several million persons who want jobs are without jobs. Many of them are getting by for a short time on meager unemployment compensation benefits.

The Government of the United States has an important responsibility to prevent economic depression. That responsibility was written into law under the Truman administration, when the Employment Act of 1946 was passed. As a Member of Congress I supported that legislation.

The Federal Government has many opportunities and can use many resources to fight off depression, provided its leaders are willing to take bold and decisive action. If the administration fails to act, I shall support legislation in the Congress directing the administration to take whatever steps are necessary to maintain high levels of employment. Steady jobs and good wages are the foundation of national prosperity.

TAX RELIEF

Because jobs are getting scarcer, workers as a whole are earning less money and buying less at the stores. To keep our economy healthy and growing, purchasing power must be maintained. I will support every legitimate action toward this end.

One of the important steps we can take to strengthen buying power is to increase the exemption allowed to individuals on their income taxes. The average family of modest income, if permitted to deduct several hundred dollars above the present exemption from its

income tax, will have that much more money for the essentials of family living. Those dollars injected into the bloodstream of the economy will have a powerful stimulating effect on business.

Too much attention is being directed to tax relief for big corporations and wealthy individuals and not enough to tax relief for the American family of modest income. I believe the wage-earning taxpayer deserves a break and the economy certainly needs it. I will vote for legislation to increase the exemption on income taxes for individuals.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL CARE

Good health is basic to the happiness and productivity of our people. There is growing recognition in this country that health protection and good medical care should be brought within the reach of everyone. Certainly some means must be found to cope with the staggering costs of serious and prolonged illness.

The Federal Government is helping to improve the health of American citizens by financial contributions and technical assistance to States for the construction of hospitals, for maternal and child health services, for vocational rehabilitation, for research in industrial hygiene and other public health fields. Federal research programs are being conducted in cancer, heart diseases, mental illness, and other serious afflictions of humanity. Medical facilities are available to veterans and to members of the armed services.

I believe that the Government has a responsibility to make sure that no citizen is deprived of happiness and long life because he cannot afford adequate medical care. I believe this responsibility can be discharged without regimenting doctors and without limiting the freedom of individuals to choose their own doctors.

None of us wants medicine to be socialized, but all of us want the opportunity to get proper medical attention when we need it, and to be able to pay our doctor bills. President Eisenhower himself has recognized these needs in a special message to the Congress. I shall support all legislative measures, including increased income-tax deductions for medical expenses, to ease the burden of medical costs and to afford our people the health protection and medical care they need and deserve.

HOUSING

Good homes for all American families are tied in with other measures to insure a prosperous economy and the happiness and well-being of our people. Housing construction at a sustained rate provides jobs in many industries and the foundation for steady economic growth. Together with slum clearance and community development it also means that American children will grow up in better family and neighborhood surroundings and become better citizens.

The Congress will be called upon to review existing housing legislation and to provide more incentives to industry to build and finance homes. I shall support all constructive housing measures that will encourage home building and

will enable families to purchase homes on more liberal credit terms.

Furthermore, I shall support a program of public housing for those families who do not have the means of buying or renting decent homes. Opportunities to obtain such housing should be afforded all low-income families, whatever their nationality, religious, or racial background.

I believe the Government must take the initiative, too, in promoting slum clearance and reconstruction of blighted areas that are breeding places of crime and disease in our cities.

ATOMIC ENERGY FOR PEACE

As a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, I have watched the development of atomic energy in this country almost from the beginning. We have made our country's defenses strong to resist aggression, but we have also prayed and worked for peace. In the hearts of all of us there is a longing for a world at peace and for putting atomic energy to work to serve the welfare of mankind rather than its destruction.

Upon the initiative of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the United States has embarked on a program of producing electric power from the atom. Already we have launched an atomic-powered submarine. Possibilities of atomic-driven locomotives and airplanes are being examined. Many exciting discoveries in medicine, agriculture, and industry are being made with the help of atomic devices.

Shortly the Congress will be called upon to review existing atomic energy legislation in order to determine what changes are needed to promote peacetime uses of atomic energy, including cooperative work with other nations. I shall support constructive measures toward these ends. I shall oppose moves which are afoot in some quarters to give monopolistic controls over peacetime atomic energy to a few large corporations. The American people are the owners of atomic plants and processes and should receive the full benefits of atomic energy development for peace.

IMPROVED IMMIGRATION LAW

Several years of experience with the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1950 [McCarran Act] have shown that the act contains many inequities and imposes unnecessary hardships on families. The harsh effects of the McCarran Act are evident in my district, which contains many Spanish-speaking families or individuals who emigrated from Mexico.

Many families have been broken up, and wives and children forced on public relief after the family breadwinner, who lived here for many years, was forced to return to Mexico because of some technical interpretation of the law.

In common fairness and decency, we owe it to our own citizens and to honest and industrious people who wish to come here from other countries, to change the McCarran Act. We must eliminate those provisions which result in discriminatory treatment against any group

or nationality and which impose unnecessary and cruel hardships.

ELIMINATING WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT

I believe that the Government has a positive duty and obligation to perform for the people those services which are essential to the general welfare. As Abraham Lincoln so aptly put it, "The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all or do so well for themselves." At the same time, I have no patience with those who are responsible for waste and mismanagement and excessive red-tape in Government.

Throughout my entire career in the Congress, I have served on the House Committee on Government Operations, which is the watchdog committee over the activities of the executive branch. Our committee has exposed many situations of wasteful expenditures, and has been instrumental in saving the taxpayers many millions, even billions, of dollars.

Recently the Speaker of the House designated me to serve on the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly known as the Hoover Commission. This Commission is investigating, and will recommend to the Congress, improved methods of Government operation.

I shall support every sound proposal for streamlining the Federal Government and for making it more efficient and more economical. I shall oppose any proposals which seek to eliminate essential services or which favor monopolistic exploitation of the public domain or the natural resources owned by all the people.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, there are other important legislative tasks which I expect to discuss with the people of my district from time to time. I wish to say now that I am greatly concerned over the mean and petty spirit of partisanship that seems to inspire so many Government leaders and officeholders. They seek to instill doubt and fear and disunity among our people instead of working for constructive programs that will make our country healthy and strong and prosperous.

From talks with people in my district and from letters they write me, I believe it is fair to say that very few are taken in by political demagogery. They expect their elected representatives to take a reasoned approach to Government and to work constructively for the good of all. I have tried to be faithful to that concept of congressional service.

CONTROL OF THE NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD CO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the people of New England are very much

concerned with the persons who control the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. This road is probably the main economic lifeblood of New England. The future of New England depends greatly upon the right type of leadership in control of this company; leadership which has the public interest uppermost in their minds as well as the stockholders.

Operating control of the New Haven Railroad which, under local management, has been making giant strides toward economic recovery, threatens once again to pass into the hands of outsiders.

That would be most harmful to the people of New England.

The present New Haven management, under Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr., has halted a half-century of deficit operations. It is giving the public what it wants—a well-run system of rail transportation.

This welcome change in the character of the New Haven Road has been paying off.

For nearly 50 years the New Haven has been milked and mugged by financial interests having no regard whatever for its service territory nor for the people who live there.

From the time of the Mellon debacle, it has been the victim of a long succession of absentee landlords, bankers' agents, Wall Street holding companies, and court-appointed trustees.

They had a universal remedy for whatever ailed the system. It was to amputate the service and throw away the substance.

What can we expect if the present able management is thrown out and a group of financial manipulators is installed in its place?

It is most alarming to learn from the Interstate Commerce Commission that the Patrick B. McGinnis group, now seeking to wrest the New Haven from the Dumaines, was scathingly criticized by the ICC for the working over it gave the finances of the Norfolk Southern Railroad.

Every New Englander, Congressmen and all, should read the devastating report of an ICC investigation, recently published as Docket No. 30980, into the honesty, economy, and efficiency of Norfolk Southern Railway management.

This report is loaded with exposures of questionable practices by the McGinnis management, some in outright defiance of Commission orders, including habitual misuse of company funds for the private transactions of its officers.

The report abounds in descriptions of waste and huge expense accounts. It tells of the organization of curious satellite corporations by company officers and of fringe transactions they made with themselves, as representatives of both.

This duality of interest appears in many phases of the Norfolk Southern investigation but ICC found no trace of objection on the part of the railway's directors, some of whom would now perform the same function on the New Haven.

Only because Norfolk Southern is now in different hands, which have eliminated all objectionable practices, did the respondents escape being more seriously dealt with. At it was, a fine was imposed on the railroad following a plea of nolo contendere.

Here, indeed, is a capsule of what may very well befall the New Haven Railroad if McGinnis succeeds in his proxy fight against Dumaine. Heavily backed by Canadian capital, this group is interested chiefly in getting larger immediate financial returns, not necessarily in restoring public confidence in the railroad and the kind of service that will guarantee its own and New England's prosperity.

If the threatened upset of New Haven management takes place, New England's hopes for industrial recovery will receive a body blow.

With control vested in a group whose largest stockholder interest lies north of the border, we shall run a bad second to the plans of any outside banking combine or group.

In such event, because the change will profoundly affect the public interest, which Congress and our Government are sworn to protect, it will become the duty of those of us who represent the New England area to take all necessary steps to investigate this situation from top to bottom.

I will gladly cooperate with any of my colleagues in taking such action as may be necessary to protect in this case the best interest of New England.

The Canadian interest should stop, look, and listen before they take any action which would be contrary to the best interest of New England and for the best interest of the New Haven Railroad. In connection with this, they should give full consideration to public opinion in New England which, based on the fine leadership of Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr., is practically solidly behind him.

Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr., a product of New England, succeeded his father as president of the New Haven in 1951.

Under Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr.'s progressive management, the locomotive power on the New Haven is now entirely electric or diesel.

Many—1,325—units of new equipment have been placed in operation and additional units—284—of necessary equipment have been authorized.

Construction of new warehouse facilities in New York and Boston have been completed which will produce additional freight traffic.

Surplus real estate and old equipment, no longer of use to the road, have been sold.

Other investments, such as station improvements, parking areas, improved roadbeds, and new rail, have been made for the purpose of providing more efficient and economical transportation.

Under his guidance the New Haven has taken an active part in the construction of the new South Boston Market terminal. This terminal attracts additional freight to New England, facilitates

the movement of meat products from the supplier to the wholesaler with ultimate distribution to the retailer in an efficient and economic manner. It represented farseeing and courageous leadership. It brings great benefits to the New Haven railroad and at the same time solves the great problem confronting the city of Boston.

Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr., is a throw-back to those hardy men who dared, and who decades and even generations ago built New England as a great industrial area.

New England needs the leadership of Frederic C. Dumaine, Jr. We need more men of his type.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of committees under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

MESSRS. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), JENSEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. RAINS), DAVIS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), FALLON (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ), indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FINO.
Mr. YOUNGER.
Mr. GUBSER.
Mr. HOSMER.
Mr. PELL.
Mr. HELLER in two instances.
Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.
Mr. RABAUT.
Mr. WILSON of California.
Mr. MULTER in two instances.
Mr. PHILBIN in two instances and to include additional matter.
Mr. DOLLINGER and to include additional matter.
Mrs. HARDEN.
Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. HOLFIELD).
Mr. DONOHUE.
Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend the remarks he makes on the State Department appropriation bill tomorrow and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken

from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 235. An act for the relief of Rev. Armando Fuoco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 267. An act for the relief of Pantelis Morfessis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 662. An act for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 740. An act for the relief of Santa Muciaccia (Sister Maria Fridiana), Teresa Saragaglia (Sister Maria Eutrofia), and Caterina Isonni (Sister Maria Giovita); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 747. An act for the relief of Jacek Von Henneberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 893. An act for the relief of David T. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 915. An act for the relief of Augusta Bleys (also known as Augustina Bleys); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 924. An act for the relief of Sofia B. Panagouloupoulos Kanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 929. An act for the relief of Cleopatra Stavros Milionis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 945. An act for the relief of Moshe Gips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1265. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1594. An act for the relief of Berenice Catherine Montgomery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1691. An act to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia, and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2534. An act for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2698. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2773. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2937. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House

of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6130. An act to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1160. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz., and to accept other land in exchange therefor.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 1, 1954:

H. R. 8069. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

On March 2, 1954:

H. R. 6130. An act to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 3, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1315. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 in the amount of \$34,541 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 340); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1316. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to repeal section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers, and for other purposes,'" approved June 25, 1934; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 453. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7328. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; without amendment (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 454. Resolution for con-

sideration of H. R. 6788. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SCHENCK: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 196. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of Dr. Marcus Whitman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1067. A bill to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8045. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 459. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7339, a bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1264). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 8149. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8150. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 8151. A bill to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8152. A bill to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 8153. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the National Encampment of the Sons of Union Veterans to be held in Duluth, Minn., August 8 to August 13, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 8154. A bill to provide for construction of bulletproof, shatterproof glass

screens in the spectator's galleries of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 8155. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1955, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 8156. A bill to provide for entertainment allowance to the chaplain at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 8157. A bill to authorize additional credits in the accounts of certain employees in the civil-service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 8158. A bill to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8159. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 8160. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 8161. A bill to provide for a system of turning, starting, and stopping signals for the operation of motor vehicles, and a system of highway signs, to be uniform throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8162. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of postmasters for fixtures and equipment in use at the time of discontinuance of such post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8163. A bill to provide that equipment for use in post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 8164. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to exempt certain marketing regulations, when issued after the beginning of the marketing season of the commodity concerned, from certain formal requirements of notice and publication; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8165. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, so as to authorize a full and fair hearing of claims when demanded by the applicant; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 8166. A bill to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 8167. A bill to clarify the religious exemption under the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 8168. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize disposal of surplus farm products to Federal, State, and local hospitals and penal and correctional institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 8169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children through the eighth grade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 8170. A bill to require inside latches on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 8171. A bill to provide for the restoration of the U. S. S. *Olympia* and for her disposition to the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 8172. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 8173. A bill to provide that the carrying of a deadly weapon on or about the person in the presence of either House of Congress, or any committee thereof, shall be a felony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 8174. A bill to promote the agriculture of the United States by acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture in foreign countries and the marketing of American agricultural commodities, and the products thereof, outside of the United States; to authorize the creation of an Agricultural Foreign Service in the Department of Agriculture; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 8175. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to reduce the "absorption" requirement from 3 percent to 2 percent for small school districts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 8176. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of all persons for damages arising out of the lowering of the water table in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 8177. A bill providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 8178. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the donation of food commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 8179. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 8180. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors,

and airmen of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 8181. A bill to extend the time within which persons may file for certain compensation benefits under laws administered by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 460. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erickson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct an investigation and study of the steps which can be taken to promote the safety of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. Res. 455. Resolution providing for a referendum on the question of independence for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. Res. 456. Resolution providing for payment of certain hospital, medical, and nursing expenses; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 457. Resolution providing for investigation of appropriate security measures for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 453. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the possibility of providing adequate protection for Members of the House, legislative employees, and the visiting public during sessions of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 8182. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Schober Frugia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 8183. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Ida Geissler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 8184. A bill authorizing and requesting the President to award the Legion of Merit posthumously to Maj. William V. Holohan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 8185. A bill for the relief of Olga I. Papadopolou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8186. A bill for the relief of Esther Silvera Escobedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOWELL:

H. R. 8187. A bill for the relief of Cecil Edgar Deonarine, Mrs. Gloria Deonarine (nee Ramjattansingh), and Jessel J. Deonarine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 8188. A bill for the relief of B. F. Reames, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 8189. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.